

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

60

VOL. VIII. NEW SERIES.

JANUARY—APRIL,

MDCCCLXVII.

LONDON:

BURNS, LAMBERT, & OATES, 17 PORTMAN STREET,

AND 63 PATERNOSTER ROW.

DERBY: RICHARDSON & SONS.

DUBLIN: JAMES DUFFY; W. B. KELLY.

1867.

WYMAN AND SONS,
ORIENTAL, CLASSICAL, AND GENERAL PRINTERS,
GREAT QUEEN STREET, W.C.

CONTENTS.



ART. I.—DR. WHATELY.

Points of agreement and contrast between Whately and Samuel Johnson	1
Dr. Whately's earlier life	5
Always a party leader and intolerant of opposition	8
His singular narrow-mindedness	12
His large heartedness, affectionateness, and generosity	15
Appointed Archbishop of Dublin	16
His change of opinion on the Irish Establishment	18
The National Education scheme	21
Dr. Whately has had no lasting theological influence	24



ART. II.—THE RELATIONS OF S. PAUL WITH S. PETER.

Protestant view of S. Paul's relation with S. Peter	26
Apostolic doctrine on the Ceremonial Law	27
The whole denationalization of the Church was effected before S. Paul became an Apostle	30
The early Christian history of S. Paul	34
His elevation to the Apostolate	37
Various forms of contemporary Judaizing error	38
S. Paul's visit to Jerusalem on occasion of these errors	40
Scripture evidence both for S. Peter's Primacy and for his full Christian knowledge	41
Circumstances connected with S. Peter's subsequent abode at Antioch	47
S. Paul's language to the Galatians concerning S. Peter	49



ART. III.—MEDIEVAL MANICHÆISM AND THE INQUISITION.

The civil punishment of religious offences	53
The doctrines and history of Manichæism	59
Fearful dangers with which it menaced Christendom in the thirteenth century	70

Innocent III. appoints missionaries to the Manichæans	71
Indisputable justice of the war declared against the Albigenses	72
Tribunal of the Inquisition established	73
Its principal end the bringing to light hidden crime	80
It further saved innumerable heretics from the flames	<i>ib.</i>
Extraordinary success of the Church's policy	82

ART. IV.—DR. PUSEY ON ECCLESIASTICAL UNITY.

The historical evidence of Catholicism irresistible	83
Christianity at starting was identified with one corporate society	86
The principle of intellectual captivity	92
Original extent of the Church's infallibility	93
Inspiration of the Apostles, wherein it consisted	97
The Church's original constitution and Rule of Faith	100
Dr. Pusey's view of her present constitution and Rule of Faith	105
Reply to him	108
Summary of the argument	116

ART. V.—JOAN OF ARC AND HER MISSION.

Copiousness of extant materials for a true judgment on Joan of Arc	118
State of France when her public career began	121
Her early life	123
The first of her visions	127
Her first interview with the king	129
She is placed by him over the French troops	133
The battle of Orleans	136
Coronation of the king at Rheims	139
Extent of Joan's mission	140
Her holiness and heroism	142
She falls into the hands of the English	143
Her trial, condemnation, and death	144

ART. VI.—THE DIRECTORIUM ANGLICANUM.

Action and Speech always employed in the worship of the Church	155
Heresies reject ceremonial	156
Ritualism a reaction in the contrary sense	157
General character of the Directorium Anglicanum	158
Its detailed direction	160
The Rubric in regard to Communion	162
General tendency of the Ritualist movement	163

ART. VII.—TWO CRITICISMS ON THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

Undue preponderance of theology	164
Real ends of the REVIEW	165
Objections to its "peremptory and overbearing tone"	167
The real state of the case in that regard	167
Open questions	171

ART. VIII.—DR. MCCOSH'S "INTUITIONS OF THE MIND" AND "EXAMINATION OF MILL'S PHILOSOPHY."

Dr. McCosh's position as a metaphysician	173
The Preface to the "Intuitions"	174
His carelessness in regard to syllogistic reasoning	177
Physics and metaphysics	179
Differs with Leibnitz	180
Criticism on Mill	184
Dr. Ward's "Nature and Grace"	189

ART. IX.—THE STATE OF AFFAIRS.

Character of the year 1866.	192
The Pope's address to the French garrison	194
Review of the French Emperor's policy at Rome	195
Effect of the attempts of Italians to assassination	200
The war with Austria	202
Assurances to the Papacy	203
The events which followed the war	204
Present state of opinion in France	206
Position of the Emperor in 1866	207
Mazzini's revolutionary programme	209
Action of the Revolutionary Party for years past	212
Parallel of Fenianism	214
Increasing difficulty of the monarchs	215
Baron Ricasoli's Letter	216
His conception of American law	217
His letters compared with the Syllabus	218
APPENDIX TO OCTOBER ARTICLE ON MARIAN DOCTRINE	219

NOTICES OF BOOKS:—

Sanctissimi Dei nostri Pii Papæ IX. Allocutiones	221
Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop of Westminster	223
The Temporal Power in its political aspect by the Archbishop of Westminster	223

F. Newman's Sermon, The Pope and the Revolution	223
F. Faber's Notes on Doctrinal Subjects	227
Tractatus de Beatâ Mariâ Virgine	229
Monitum	230
S. Liberius, Pope—Revue des Questions Historiques	231
Abbé Freppel's Clement of Alexandria	233
M. Mourissan's Spinoza et la Naturalisme Contemporaine	238
Erasmî Colloquia Selecta	240
P. Chocarne's Life of P. Lacordaire	242
Lady Herbert's Three Phases of Christian Love	245
Judgment in the case of Dr. Colenso	246
Lady Herbert's Impressions of Spain	250
The Month	251
The recent Pastorals of the French Bishops, edited by F. Vaughan	252

CONTENTS.

ART. I.—SCIENCE, PRAYER, FREE WILL, AND MIRACLES.

Objections against religion founded on the fact of phenomenal uniformity	255
Intimate connection of physical science with Theology	261
Phenomenal uniformity in no way disproves God's unintermittent pre-movement of phenomena	266
Physical phenomena, taken by themselves, tell rather in favour of such pre-movement	269
The same argument holds in regard to that particular pre-movement, Divine Grace	282
The doctrine of Free Will explained	283
Objections to it answered	286
Extent to which this doctrine interferes with the strictly scientific character of psychology	290
Miracles, however frequent, in no way affect the foundation of physical science	292

ART. II.—ENGLISH CATHOLIC POOR-SCHOOLS.

True principles on education of the poor	299
Great difficulty of obtaining schoolmasters, and vital importance of obtaining them	303
The secular instruction required by Government is by no means excessive	305
Catholic schools for girls and for infants perhaps surpass all other such schools	308
Inadequate payment of schoolmasters is the great obstacle in the way of educating boys	310
Means for removing this obstacle	311

ART. III.—NEW AMERICA.

The United States are the only country in which Protestantism has been a seed of the national life	316
They reflect the English Protestantism of the future	319
The Mormons: their great doings	323

Those great doings are in no way connected with their polygamy, which on the contrary is the germ of their future decline	332
If the United States are right in putting down by force Mormon polygamy, Catholic Europe was right in putting down by force the false religion of the Albigenses and other heretics	337
Strange and unsettled state of opinion throughout the States	339
Catholicism the only hope for their future	345

ART. IV.—S. CYRIL AND THE TUMULTS OF ALEXANDRIA.

Accession of S. Cyril to the Patriarchal throne	349
Expulsion of the Jews and murder of Hypatia, as narrated by Socrates	351
State of the Jews at that time throughout Christendom	356
Exceptional circumstances of Alexandria	363
Real facts of the tumults	369
The frequent turbulence of monks and solitaries at that period in the East	375
S. Cyril's true character	381

ART. V.—CATHOLIC AND PARTY POLITICS.

The argument of those who wish Catholics to identify themselves with the Conservative party	382
Reply to that argument	383
The argument of those who wish Catholics to identify themselves with the Liberal party	384
Reply to that argument	385
Third course recommended	393

ART. VI.—MR. FFOULKES ON CHRISTENDOM'S DIVISIONS.

Mr. Ffoulkes holds and denies the unity of the Church	397
He says that she was united under the Emperors	401
And rent under the Popes	404
He arbitrarily interprets the Old Testament	405
He says that an appeal lies from the Pope	411
He denies divine institution of the Papacy	412
He denies all inequality of rank and power in the Church	413
He confuses public and private penance	424
He charges the Mediæval Church with false doctrine	427
He implicitly denies the definitions of Trent	433

ART. VII.—MARY IN THE GOSPELS.

Importance of Dr. Northcote's subject	435
Mary in prophecy	437

Mary's amazing prerogative during thirty years out of our Lord's thirty-three	439
Mary's position during our Lord's Ministry and Passion, and after His Resurrection	442
General view of her life	445
Consideration of particular texts adduced by Protestants	447
Her visit to S. Elizabeth	453
Did our Lord inflict on her "humiliations" and "apparent reproofs" ?	454

ART. VIII.—THE CHURCH AND THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

Prince de Broglie's general design	456
Valentinian and Valens	458
S. Hilary	460
S. Jerome	462
Increasing influence of Christianity	463
Valens and S. Basil	464
S. Basil and S. Ambrose	468
The character of S. Ambrose	469
Church and State	470
Gratian and S. Ambrose	471
The Emperor Theodosius	474
The Church and ancient civilization	477
Parallel of the present and fourth centuries	478
M. Vitet's article in <i>Revue des Deux Mondes</i>	479
Catholics in relation to political freedom	480

ART. IX.—THE STATE OF IRELAND.

Character of the present rebellion	482
Foreign relations of the Fenians	483
Recent controversy on Irish question	484
Actual grievances of Ireland	484
Original formation of Fenian brotherhood	487
Stephens and Mazzini	487
American policy towards Ireland	488
Effect of Fenianism on England's military resources	489
The recent rising	490
Lord Kimberley	491
Prospect of continued danger	491
Necessity of conciliatory as well as repressive policy	492

X.—EXPLANATION OF A SENTENCE IN THE JANUARY NUMBER	493
--	-----

XI.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

F. Schrader De Unitate Romanà	496
F. Perrone's Prælectiones	500
F. Dalgairns on the Spiritual Life of the First Six Centuries	500
Mr. Stuart Mill's Inaugural Address at S. Andrew's	505
Mr. Farrar on Public School Education	509
Mgr. Dupanloup on Education and Le Peril Social	512
M. Veuillot's Odeurs de Paris	521
Dr. Pusey's Letter to the <i>English Churchman</i>	523
Mr. Robertson's Sermons	527
Etudes Religieuses	529
Mr. Rhodes's Letters on the "Eirenicon"	530
Herr Ritter's Geography of Palestine	532
Mr. O'Kane's Notes on the Rubrics	535
The Chronicle of Melsa	536
Madame Craven's Recit d'une Sœur	538
Miss Ingelow's Poems	541
Döllinger's First Age of Christianity	543
Debrett's Peerage	543
Kempis on the Imitation of Christ	544

T H E

DUBLIN REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1867.

ART. I.—RICHARD WHATELY.

Life and Correspondence of Richard Whately, D.D., late Archbishop of Dublin.
By E. JANE WHATELY, Author of "English Synonyms." London
Longmans, Green, & Co.

RICHARD WHATELY combined character and talents and attainments far above par with a position of great eminence and importance, and of such a man we have a right to expect a biography. Had he lived and died Rector of Halesworth, he would have been no less able and upright; had he merely eaten and drunk for seventy-six years (to borrow his own description of a contemporary Protestant prelate), he would have held as high a station; but, in either case, the world would hardly have expected a memoir. What Miss Whately has given us in those two volumes we have read with much interest, but, on the whole, not without disappointment. The book, interesting as it is, is not what we presume she intended it to be, the picture of the man. It is almost wholly made up of letters. Unfortunately, however, it would seem that of Dr. Whately's letters those which could hardly have failed to be most interesting and valuable have not been preserved. To Dr. Arnold, to his brother-in-law Mr. Bishop, and to Mr. Parsons, his schoolfellow and the husband of his tutor's daughter, he opened as he did probably to no one else. Unfortunately, of all the letters to these three, only one, addressed to Dr. Arnold, has been preserved. Strange to say, the editor has not succeeded in recovering a single letter written before he was one-and-thirty, and one only before he was thirty-eight. Then two more are preserved, and one more written at forty-one. The result is, that the first forty-four years of his life occupy in these volumes only ninety-six pages out of nine hundred and seventy. This probably could not be avoided, but it is the more to be regretted, because the brightest, happiest,

VOL. VIII.—NO. XV. [*New Series.*] B

most useful, and most commendable part of his seventy-six years were already gone by before the period at which the correspondence given in these volumes practically begins—that at which he was made Protestant Archbishop of Dublin. Moreover, Whately was not one of those, like the poet Cowper, whose letters give us a lifelike image of the man. The very great majority of those published in these volumes are mere essays, differing from those of his “Common-place Book” chiefly in being addressed at the beginning “My dear Senior.” Whether the lost letters were the same we can only conjecture. But we are clear that, the materials at her disposal being what they were, the editor would have shown a better judgment if she had published separately (either in an introduction or a separate volume) all that relates to the “life” of Dr. Whately, and had given the letters by themselves, as two volumes of “Correspondence.” The few passages of personal interest are too much lost amidst what are in fact essays well worth reading—nay, many of great interest and value—but which have little more connection with the author’s life than any chapter in any of his numerous publications.

This would in any case be a pity; in the case of Whately it is specially so, for the man was worth a great deal more than his writings. What would Samuel Johnson have been to us if Boswell’s *Life* had never been published? His very name would have been known to very few of our generation; not because he died eighty years ago, but because the things in the works once so highly valued, which come home to our feelings and wants, are comparatively few, and those few have been better said by others. How different is the case of Goldsmith. If the “*Vicar of Wakefield*” had been first discovered this year, in a forgotten manuscript, it would at once have made him an object of interest and curiosity to all readers of English. Yet Samuel Johnson, in the place he holds in men’s minds as much excels Oliver Goldsmith as the “*Vicar of Wakefield*” excels “*Rasselas*,” and that although Goldsmith’s life was in itself incomparably more full of curious adventures. The fact is that we live with Johnson, and Johnson was a man eminently worth living with. “It is clear from his conversation,” Lord Macaulay very truly says, “that he had more of that homely wisdom which nothing but experience and observation can give, than any writer since the time of Swift.” In Boswell’s book “the club-room is before us. There are assembled those heads which live for ever on the canvas of Reynolds. There are the spectacles of Burke, and the tall thin form of Langton; the courtly sneer of Beauclerk, and the beaming smile of Garrick; Gibbon tapping his snuff-box, and

Sir Joshua with his trumpet in his ear. In the foreground is that strange figure which is as familiar to us as the figures of those among whom we have been brought up. We see the eyes and mouth moving with convulsive twitches, we see the heavy form rolling, we hear it puffing, and then comes the 'Why, sir!' and the 'What then, sir?' and the 'No, sir!' and the 'You don't see your way through the question, sir!'"

It would be easy to draw a contrast between Richard Whately and Samuel Johnson. On one side the layman born in humble station, for many years struggling with pinching poverty, emerging into notice after he was fifty, never having any profession except literature, dying before the first sound of the knell which marked the fall of the old régime in France, and before the first rumblings of the earthquake which overturned all the thrones of Europe, and who retained to the last all the prejudices of that strange school which combined the theoretical maxims of the nonjurors with a practical devotion to Church and State as they existed under George III.,—which worshipped with all the reverence due to institutions moulded by the immediate hand of God, a hierarchy founded upon a spiritual rebellion, and a throne founded upon a political revolution; on the other, the clergyman, sprung from a wealthy family and trained in luxury, early attaining academical distinction and a secure professional income; educated amid the roar of the revolutionary war, and all his life holding and advocating extreme liberal theories both as to Church and State, placed in the prime of life in the highest rank of the peerage and the enjoyment of huge endowments, and daily mixed up with the contests of political parties and the measures of administrations. And yet, for our present purpose, Johnson was the special forerunner of Whately. He excelled much more as a talker than as a writer; he published numerous volumes, without leaving any original work which promises to be a permanent possession (the Dictionary is not original); he could have done nothing as a public speaker; yet in private, dissertation not conversation, was his strength; he was qualified rather for a dictatorship than a place among equals in a literary senate; he was strikingly indifferent to the ordinary forms and courtesies of society, and although remarkable for kindness of heart, was without consideration for the feelings and weaknesses of those with whom he conversed; lastly, he had, in proportion to his unquestionable abilities, a remarkable narrowness of mind. Of all his successors none so much as Whately has combined all these qualifications. To wish that he had found a Boswell may be a breach of charity towards the unknown man whom we

destine to that character; but no man can help wishing it who saw ever so little of Whately in private life, especially in his Oxford days, before he was "called to the helm of a crazy ship in a storm"—before he was stirred to fury by seeing the views which he advocated abandoned by all educated men (some leaving him on one side, some on the other), and the practical measures to the success of which he had devoted his life, condemned by almost all parties and evidently destined to speedy destruction, while he could still boast (vol. i. p. 391) that he "exercised considerable influence in Oxford," and could flatter himself that it would be permanent—before he was forced to say "Oxford is a widely different place from what it was when I resided there," without even the poor consolation of feeling that the change was caused by any intellectual decline—while he was still the teacher and honoured companion of men equal, some of them far superior to himself; above all, before he had been thrown by the circumstances of his position into direct opposition to the Church of the Living God.

If any record of his conversation at that period had been kept, posterity would have had a picture which it would not willingly have allowed to perish, of a man in many respects worthy of admiration; and, like that drawn by Boswell, it would have been the more valuable, as preserving the record of men and times which have for ever passed away; for assuredly, whatever else it may see, the world will never see again, either the Oriel common room of 1820 or "the Club" of 1760. It is much to be desired also, in justice to the memory of Whately himself. What would Samuel Johnson's memory be already if, instead of Boswell's *Life*, we had had two volumes containing little more than his correspondence, with a few connecting remarks?

We are not even yet without hope that scraps at least of this sort may have been preserved by some of those who knew Whately in earlier years. In the volumes before us we get little of it. It is probable that Miss Whately herself has not had the means of obtaining it. It is almost certain that, even if she had, her partiality to her father's memory would have forbidden her to paint such a portrait as Cromwell demanded, in which the scars and wrinkles should appear in their full proportions. Indeed, she apologizes for allowing Dr. Hinds to record his first introduction.

He was at the time a B.A. and in lodgings. There I received my first lecture. His apartment was a small one, and the little room in it was much reduced by an enormous sofa, on which I found him stretched at length with a pipe in his mouth, the atmosphere becoming denser and denser as he puffed.

This was in 1811, and the scene can hardly be appreciated unless we remember that at that time smoking (even a cigar, much more a pipe) was as strange a portent in a gentleman as it now is in a lady. We strongly suspect, however, that the pupil ought to have added that the tutor's legs (or one of them at least) were thrown over the back of the "enormous sofa."

We cannot forbid ourselves to hope that the interesting though imperfect sketch of the first forty-four years of Whately's life may yet be filled up by some one who may have access to memoranda not accessible to his daughter, and who will venture to paint him as he was. The outline is soon traced. He was the youngest of the nine children of Joseph Whately, who, according to the custom of those days, held a prebendal stall at Bristol, the vicarage of Widford, and the lectureship at Gresham College, while he resided at Nonsuch Park, Surrey, where Richard was born, February 1, 1787. In his earlier years he was "feeble and puny," and used to tell that he had been weighed against a turkey and found wanting. He was so wholly without healthy appetite, that "the sensation of hunger was something new and strange when he first felt it as a boy of eleven or twelve." He records his sufferings from shyness. But query whether all persons have not the same recollection, children being aware of what they themselves suffer from this cause, and not comparing it with that felt by others? For three years, from between five and six, he had a wonderful power of mental calculation, and was employed "either in calculation or castle-building, morning, noon, and night." The power left him, he says, "a perfect dunce at cyphering," which he continued ever after. At nine years he went to a private school, where he remained till sent to Oriel College at eighteen. Here his mind was developed and formed, by the influence of a college tutor, Copleston, afterwards Bishop of Llandaff and Dean of St. Paul's. When twenty-two he "commenced a plan which he continued up to within a few months of his death; viz., that of noting down his thoughts in a commonplace book, a considerable part of which" has been published. The fly-leaf of his first note-book bears the inscription, "Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be always acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my Redeemer." In 1808 he became Bachelor of Arts, obtaining a place in the second class both of classics and mathematics. In 1811 he was elected fellow of Oriel, which gave him a high social position in the University, and a comfortable income to be held till death or marriage. He then began to take private pupils, and among the number some who remained his friends for life. At Oriel he resided

until 1822, when he was appointed to the benefice of Halesworth, in Suffolk, by his uncle, Mr. Plumer. He was, however, unable to continue in residence, for the air acted as a poison to Mrs. Whately. He returned to Oxford, and was appointed by Lord Grenville (Chancellor of the University) Principal of St. Alban's Hall, in 1825. His predecessor had been an eminent scholar, but had neglected the Hall, and its reputation was bad. A student of another college passing the gate at an hour when, by the rule of the University, all college doors were locked, saw the gate standing open, and remarked to his companion, "*Noctes diesque patet atri janua Ditis.*" Dr. Whately made a great reformation, undertaking the tuition in person, and obtaining the best assistance. It was here that Dr. Newman was his Vice-Principal until 1826, when he became College Tutor in Oriel, of which he was Fellow; and it was at this time that Whately attained the influence over the mind of the younger man which is so gracefully mentioned in the "*Apologia.*" Here he remained till he was promoted by Earl Grey to the Protestant Archbishopric of Dublin in September, 1832.

The peculiarity of Whately's college career, if his own unquestionably sincere judgment is to be admitted, was his resolute refusal to join any party, either political or religious. It is curious to see how continually he refers to this both in commendation of himself (the word must be spoken) and in censure of others. He gathered around him a number of men younger than himself, trained them in his own opinions, and allowed them to act with him in everything at his suggestion. This, however, he assures us and himself was not by any means to form a party, because his only desire was that they should form their opinions independently, and act upon them for themselves. Indeed, he would have considered it the worst possible compliment, that any man should adopt an opinion because it was his. But, then, his opinions were always founded upon unanswerable arguments. That any of his followers should exercise his mind independently gave him nothing but pleasure. But if he exercised it fairly, calmly, and without prejudice, it being assumed that he was ordinarily clear-headed, he must of necessity come to the same conclusions at which Whately had already arrived; for Whately's opinion upon each subject which arose was the only one to which reason could possibly lead. On the other hand, if he saw a dozen men or more agreeing in holding opinions which he rejected, it was plain that they must needs be held together by party spirit and nothing else. What else, indeed, could it be? Not reasonable conviction; for in that case they would adopt the only views consistent with reason; viz., those of Whately

himself. It must be, therefore, that they sacrificed truth to party. This representation of his state of mind may seem an overstatement; but any one who examines the volumes before us will see that it is really correct. The thing was seen even by his blindest admirers. His friend Mr. Dickinson meets the charge that "he drew around him a cordon of flatterers" (vol. ii. p. 428). He admits, "if the truth is to be told, as I desire to tell it, there is foundation enough for the sneer to claim some notice of it, particularly as the same thing has been elsewhere and frequently repeated. There was a sort of flattery administered to him by some, and much too trustfully and cordially accepted by him, I will acknowledge. But it was flattery of a peculiar sort. It did not take the form of praise." He goes on to say Whately had two special characteristics—"love of teaching" and "craving for sympathy."

Some who wished to gain his favour made a habit of inquiring his opinion, and asking his counsel on this question or that. He was, of course, delighted to get a pupil. He would call such a person "a very good anvil." It did sometimes happen, I know, that he saw through the motive of the inquiry—obvious enough, indeed, to fill bystanders with disgust—but he would take advantage of the opportunity of teaching, nevertheless, thereby giving the impression that he was gratified by getting it, and holding out encouragement to those who sought in this manner to please him. Oftener than not, however, he imputed his own guileless honesty to the questioner, and gave him credit for a sincere desire to learn. And then, when he found such an apparently intelligent disciple, bringing out something which he had really learned from one of Whately's own books, the Archbishop would hail the opinion with pleasure as a quite "undesigned coincidence," and think he had found another likeminded with himself. In this way his love of teaching and his desire for sympathy exposed him to the charge of allowing, if not accepting, what other people saw to be flattery (vol. ii. p. 429).

In other words, what the archbishop liked was an *assentator*. This was when he was the dispenser of large patronage and princely hospitality. How matters went in his earlier days, at Oxford, we are told by Mr. Merivale (i. 27):—

His attachment to his own particular set—to those few who were his real intimates—was almost feminine in its tenderness, and most constant in its durability. Any friend of Whately's was (in his view) something sacred—some one whose views and writings and character were to be defended against all comers, and at all hazards. And no one can have failed to remark in his writings traces of that curious self-delusion which sometimes affects men of strong minds and stronger affections, who are by nature teachers rather than readers and listeners. Judgments and sentiments which he had himself instilled into his sectaries, when reproduced by them, struck him as novelties

and he may frequently be caught quoting with much approbation expressions of this or that follower, which are in truth mere "Whateleana," consciously or unconsciously borrowed from him.

Mr. Dickinson says again :—

He could not easily make a close friend of any one whose opinions set him at a distance. Dr. Arnold is, I think, the only instance among his close and chosen friends of one whose opinions differed considerably from his own. But there was a thorough *moral* sympathy between the men that was quite strong enough to bridge over all differences. Arnold's intense love of truth and manly simplicity of character were thoroughly appreciated and loved by Dr. Whately (vol. ii. p. 431).

No doubt; but there were others quite as remarkable for these qualities, whom Whately was not only unable to regard as friends, but the sincerity of whose professions he could not bring himself to believe. The real reason of the difference was clear. Arnold held a theory different from his (and indeed from that of all other men) about "Church and State." But on the whole his views, and especially his practical opinions on University manners, were quite the same as Whately's; and hence only it was that Whately forgave him for a merely theoretical difference of opinion upon a single point.

On the whole, therefore, while we fully believe that Dr. Whately most sincerely believed himself to be always free from party spirit, and that all who differed from him were of necessity "party men;" the fact evidently was, that he was only thus far independent, that he reasoned out his opinions for himself, following the track in which (as he expressly tells us) he had been placed by his tutor Copleston; that he adopted conclusions unpopular in Oxford, where there really was at that time no "liberal party;" that as he gradually advanced in years and rose to higher stations, he gathered around him a set of his juniors, who echoed his own opinions, and in whom (however unconsciously) he really admired and worshipped the reflection of himself. In other words, he formed a party around himself, and became a party leader without having been a subordinate member of any party.

And, among party leaders, it must be admitted, none was ever more intolerant of opposition. No cave of Adullam found mercy from him. Mr. Dickinson says, "It is curious that one who had so intense a craving for sympathy should nevertheless have had small power of sympathy himself." This seems to have resulted from the peculiar character of his mind. He belonged, as his biographer says, to the Aristotelian class. Upon religious questions, happily for him, he

took as his major premise the truth and authority of the sacred books acknowledged by the English Establishment; and from this premise he worked out his conclusions by the driest intellectual argumentation. Of course it was simply impossible that by such a course he should come to true conclusions, because the New Testament Scriptures, not being in form systematic and dogmatical, can be fully understood only by those who bring to them a knowledge of the religious belief and practice of those by and for whom they were written. Thus, not merely supernaturally but naturally, the possession of the Catholic Faith is a necessary qualification for a sound interpreter of Scripture. Whately went avowedly on the very opposite principle. The fact that many things instituted by our Blessed Lord and His Apostles are not mentioned in Scripture seemed to him a positive proof that the writers of Scripture were expressly prevented from mentioning them, lest succeeding generations should think them binding. And hence the result was that, having reasoned out his creed for himself by hard, logical argumentation, from what he assumed to be the only source of truth, he was intolerant in the extreme of any difference from his conclusions. Mr. Merivale says (vol. i. p. 105):—

Whately's opinions, early thought out for himself, underwent little change or modification, in the one direction or the other. Generally speaking, Whately occupied an intermediate position, throughout life, between the high dogmatic school in the Church and the school which refines away dogma into mere sentiment. The articles of his creed were therefore few, but they were adhered to with great steadiness; and it may be added not without some tendency to depreciate those minds which could not rest satisfied with his "common-sense" view (as some disparagingly called it) of Christianity.

Such, then, was Whately's real position; he was essentially the leader of a religious party, the test of which was agreement with the conclusions which he had thought out for himself, by a process which seemed to him so inevitably certain, that his first feeling (and unfortunately his last also) was that any man who professed Christianity and yet did not accept his view of it, must be either puzzle-headed or insincere—either a knave or a fool.

This is more than enough to account for his intense, and, it must be said, uncharitable animosity against the theological school which sprung up in Oxford in 1833 and the following years. In this school everything combined to excite his indignation. First, it directly assailed his personal influence and following; next, the illustrious man whom it pleased God to employ as the chief agent in that great movement, had in early

youth been, to a certain extent, among his own followers. Hence, all who inclined in a Catholic direction he named "Newman's party;" he even came to speak of them as his own "persecutors." And strange to say (considering that he had personally known and even loved the great man of whom he spoke), he repeatedly and deliberately charges him and all who agreed with him with insincerity.

Take, for instance, the case of Dr. Hampden. If ever there was one which sincere Anglicans who thought dogma important could not fail to feel with the utmost acuteness, it was when a man who (though without any special originality) had published in England the Rationalistic theories of the German Neologians was made, without any claims except that publication, Professor of Theology in the great Anglican University. In fact, nothing could more strongly have proved that they did not really believe what they professed than their failing to oppose such an appointment. That Whately should be annoyed at the opposition was natural, for Dr. Hampden was one of his own immediate followers, and besides, dogma, as such, was always the object of his dislike. But he was not content to condemn Dr. Hampden's opponents as they condemned Dr. Hampden, as acting on a false and mistaken principle; on the contrary, he all along declares that they were insincere, as positively as if he had read their hearts; that they did not themselves believe what they said; that they were not actuated by the motives they professed, but by others widely different.

We need only quote a few words out of very many: "There never was a more lame and palpably false pretence so shamefully brought forward. I used often to remark while it was going on, that the instances continually displayed in it [the persecution of Dr. Hampden] of combined folly, cruelty, and baseness were startling, even to one who, like me, had not anticipated much greatness or goodness from human nature." This was said long after the event, and when he had had time to view it coolly.

The opposition to Hampden he attributes to "the party," but adds, "the support the party received at the time of that persecution from those who did not really belong to them, but opposed Hampden from political or other motives, gave them a great lift."

This was his way for accounting for the fact that the Low Church school represented by the *Record*, was as strongly opposed to Hampden as the writer of the Oxford Tracts; the fact being, that Hampden had jarred against their strongest religious feelings. Their motive was "political," because Dr.

Whately did not share those feelings. He speaks as follows of a work by Dr. Newman eight or nine years after its publication :—

I cannot conceive any one either writing or reading that tissue of deliberate and artful misrepresentations (comparing it with Hampden's own volume) without perceiving—unless he were a downright fool—that it consisted of the *suppressio veri*, so contrived as to amount to the *suggestio falsi*—the kind of lies which Swift justly calls the worst, “a lie guarded.” The author and the approvers of such a work (as many as were acquainted with Hampden's) could have nothing to learn from the “slanderer” himself.

That is, that Dr. Newman is as great a liar as the devil himself. Still later he says that he “endeavoured to persuade those who had never read the work that it was quite different from what it is.” We need quote no more instances of this personal abuse. Those who have a taste for such things will be gratified in many other parts of the volumes. As for those who agreed with Dr. Newman, they are called “furious party men vehemently excited”—“a party of furious bigots”—“decidedly schismatical”—“unjust, antichristian, inhuman, schismatical.” But this is not enough. He declares (vol. ii. p. 37), “The attack on Hampden was not really caused by the alleged heterodoxy of his Bampton lectures, but by his proposing to give dissenters the same facilities at Oxford as they enjoy [at Dublin].”

Nor was it only the assailants of Dr. Hampden whom he thus judges. We very much doubt whether in the whole of these two volumes (indeed we might say the same of all Dr. Whately's works as far as we know them) there is so much as one single instance in which he admits that a person who, professing Christianity, differs materially from himself can be honestly mistaken. For instance, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge hesitated about putting one of his tracts on their list for general circulation. This he attributes to jealousy of himself as a successful author, on the part of men many of whom were publishers, and all writers of sermons. Of Dr. Newman he says incidentally, “if he has any belief of [Christianity].” Much later in life, as soon as he had a difference with the Irish Education Commissioners, he says, “Their plan is to circulate gross falsehoods and misrepresentations, which are credited for a short time, but, when detected, double the disgust felt, not only for their conduct, but also for their mode of defending it. Many of these falsehoods cannot indeed be traced exactly to the Commissioners themselves, but as some can, the public will not give them credit for being scrupulous about the rest.” He called them

also "men of mature age, who were supposed to possess common sense and common honesty, and to have some regard for their character."

Elsewhere he says, "The more enlightened of the Roman Catholic priests probably suspect—indeed, if they are candid, *must* suspect—that when they differ from us they are often wrong." And again, "Many Roman Catholics must have the sense to perceive that some of their practices will not bear the test of reason."

He stated to Father Ignatius Spencer that Dr. Cahill "made statements concerning individuals which he must have known to be false." The friend who records this says, "Mr. Spencer did not seem disposed to continue his defence or apology for Dr. Cahill," not seeing that it was not his custom to enter into such personal disputes.

De Tocqueville having had a conversation on religious matters with Mr. Senior, the Archbishop remarks, "Though he probably believed a good deal more than was true, he could hardly have believed all he said" (vol. ii. p. 317).

"Mr. Thackeray," on his return from America, "was saying at a party where I met him, that the cases of ill usage [of slaves] are only here and there, one out of many thousands, and that Mrs. Stowe's picture is as if one should represent the English as humpbacked or a club-foot nation" . . . "I cannot but conclude that he knew better about slavery."

We might greatly multiply these instances. The plain truth is, as we have already said, that although naturally a kind and even generous-hearted man, his confidence in the process by which he arrived at his conclusions was such, that he found it impossible to believe that any man could materially differ from them, unless he were either a knave or a fool. He was equally incapable of believing that people, whatever they might profess, could really like what he disliked. Thus, he could hardly be ignorant that Catholics, both men and women, profess that they could have no confidence in a married confessor. But, not sharing this feeling, he cannot believe they really have it. He writes to Senior, "I wonder you should have apparently acquiesced in the very shallow defence by Tocqueville of the celibacy of the clergy as qualifying men for the *confessional*; could either of you doubt that, if the experiment were tried, and priests allowed to marry, all decent women would choose a married confessor?"

The simple fact was that, for all his undoubted ability and all his liberalism, Whately was in his way one of the most narrow-minded of men. He supported the proposal to put convents under an inspection similar to that of madhouses,

saying, "If the system be indeed so perfect, let all men see and judge of it. As long as these establishments are kept cautiously veiled from the public eye, suspicions" will be entertained. He had heard the reasons why Catholics object to this; but not feeling them himself, did not believe that any one could sincerely object unless he knew of something that needed concealment.

He saves the honesty of some who differ from him by denying their intellectual power. Thus, he writes in 1846, "What they can see in Gladstone I cannot think. His mind is full of cul-de-sacs." * Miss Whately apologizes for this. "The Archbishop is speaking of one whom he knew up to the time far more as a writer than a politician." Just so: the fact is, then, that he could see no power in Mr. Gladstone's writings. No doubt two men so able had seldom minds so unlike. But narrowness of mind consists especially in an inability to appreciate more than one kind of power. Other men of much less intellect than his, and who differed even more widely from Mr. Gladstone, discerned his powers much earlier. Lord Macaulay wrote, six years before, "We dissent from his opinions, but we admire his talents. We respect his integrity and benevolence, and we hope that he will not suffer political avocations so entirely to engross him as to leave him no leisure for literature and philosophy." Whately's unconscious argument is, "Gladstone's conclusions differ from Whately's; but Gladstone is not a knave, therefore he is a fool."

We have been much impressed on reading these volumes with the dwarfing effect upon Whately's intellect of his religious system. Had he had the blessing of a Catholic education, he would have known how to be quite confident that he knew the truth, without doubting that persons ignorant of it might nevertheless be both able and honest. A Protestant, he held his faith only as a conclusion from argument, and was of necessity driven either to admit that it was uncertain, or else to condemn as knaves or fools all who did not arrive at the same conclusion. A Protestant who is firmly fixed in what he believes, cannot with any show of consistency be other than narrow-minded. Those who value faith as the gift of God are under no such temptation.

* In the text Mr. Gladstone's name is omitted, but it is supplied in the contents of the chapter, where this passage is referred to, as "opinion of Mr. Gladstone." Miss Whately did not perceive that such an estimate of Mr. Gladstone's intellect would give people in general a low opinion of her father's judgment, and put in the whole passage in good faith. The name was erased by some more discreet friend. But the judgment is so strongly characteristic of Whately, that its omission would have injured the likeness.

A consequence still more lamentable was his hatred of dogma. He could not help feeling that the New Testament is not dogmatic in form, and therefore concluded, not that Almighty God has given us other means of knowing religious truth, but that dogma is a mere human invention. He was, of course, inconsistent, because he held certain dogmatic statements, as Mr. Merivale truly says, unchangeably. But he had so much religious earnestness, that, if he had been taught the whole Christian belief, as he was taught some parts of it, from his earliest years, he would have been the last man to consider it (as Father Newman says) "a hardship" to have definite teaching upon religious truth instead of being left to guess at it.

How much his own religious character suffered by this, God alone can judge. One result evidently is, that with all his power and all his earnestness he had little religious influence, if any, while he lived, and certainly none that has survived him. The form in which he exhibited even the religious truths which he held, and the arguments by which he supported them, failed to produce any effect upon minds differently constituted. Of this an example most painful to himself was given in the case of Mr. Blanco White, whose soul had been shaken and tossed upon a sea of doubt and error before he knew Whately, but who had then returned to the belief of a large portion at least of the Christian creed. When the new Archbishop of Dublin first offered him the post of chaplain and tutor in his family, one who well knew and loved both the men said to the writer of these lines, "Blanco White will not leave Whately's house till he is a Socinian." He went on to explain his meaning by showing the effect of Whately's hard dry logic, applied to the most sacred things, upon a mind which he said was shaking all over "like that dog," pointing out one which was half-paralyzed by the effects of the distemper. There are in the volumes before us many painful indications of the effect of his system even on his own mind. His tendency evidently was to subject Scriptural words to a sort of force for the purpose of ascertaining the least meaning which can be attributed to them. Evidently connected with this, was his dislike of pictures of "Madonnas and Holy Families," which "seemed to him only misrepresentations of Scripture, whose beauty of expression could not fatone or the false ideas conveyed." It is but too plain that while he held to the Divinity of our Blessed Lord in a sense, and was deeply pained at the conscious abandonment of it by Blanco White, he could not bear to have forced upon him the consideration that a little Infant was the Eternal God; and this

it is which a picture of the "Holy Family" forces upon the mind of every thinking man. The practice of meditation as it is taught to Catholics would have been inexpressibly offensive to him. In fact, we fear that, consciously or unconsciously, he felt what we have heard able and thoughtful Protestants avow, that our Lord is now God, and that when He was on earth He was man, but that they would rather not think what those facts did or did not infer. Supposing that all doctrines were, as he held, a mere human inference from certain expressions of Scripture, and that the expressions only were divine, we are far from sure that this would not actually be (as he evidently thought it) the most reverent way of treating revelation. We are referring especially to a letter to a friend, on religious difficulties (i. p. 208). His cautions are all against too much belief; *e.g.*, he says, "It may be that God the Son is equal to God the Father; but He is spoken of in Scripture as *one* with the Father:—'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.' It may be that 'God the Son was manifest in the flesh, and was in Christ;' but it is *said*, 'God was manifest in the flesh.' God was in the world, reconciling the world unto Himself." He continues the same line of argument. If he had had the happiness of a Catholic training, he would have known that the Catholic doctrine, *e.g.* of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, rests upon proofs quite as clear as the texts themselves which he quotes, and independent of them.

We gladly pass to subjects less painful. There are proofs in abundance that this man was really large-hearted and generous, in spite of all the narrowing effect of a human system. His peculiarities were known to all the world. The filial partiality of Miss Whately leads her to assure us of "his tender regard for men's feelings," and that his Oxford name of "the White Bear" was given him merely because he used to walk about the University (where at that period every one else, especially authorities, wore cap and gown) in a shaggy white great-coat and a white hat, accompanied by a large rough white dog." The name may or may not have had such an origin, but, however that might be, his open disregard for the more refined feelings of others notoriously kept it in use. His meaning, we believe, was always kind; but Oxford was full of anecdotes (such as we see from these volumes were equally prevalent at a later period in Dublin) of his want of capacity to see what things would be offensive to the feelings of others. Mr. Keble, one of his earliest friends, was asked, "did it rain to-day?" "Oh, no," said Keble; "I had a walk with Whately, and found it very dry." Two gentlemen found him one noon-day looking earnestly up into a tree, and, knowing his turn for the observa-

tion of natural history, went to ask what he was looking at. "The stars," said Whately; "you will see them if you look long enough." "What," said one of them, "Ursa Major, I presume?" The present writer had once the honour of dining at his table when the subject of music came under discussion. Among the party were Mr. N., his mother and sisters, and Mr. and Mrs. H. Whately (rolling himself in his chair as was his wont, and speaking as if he were talking to some one over his shoulder) pronounced in a loud voice, "I am convinced, that a talent for music has no more connection with any other talent, than the length of your nose. I can give you an example of it. Two men of the most remarkable ability I have ever known are N. and H. Of these, N. has a remarkable genius for music—H. no more ear than a pig." The same evening he told a characteristic story of himself. In public he was just the same. Many persons still living may remember him sitting at the political economy lecture (which was then delivered in one of the rooms in the tower of S. Mary's church), and spitting from a long distance off into the fire, evidently rejoicing in his skill in shooting over one man's legs and under the arms of another. One of his great points, often referred to in these volumes, was that clergymen should always preach in their natural voice. The principle is surely just, yet who ever applied it like Whately? We remember a dissipated undergraduate saying (in somewhat slang terms) that he spoke in the pulpit like a man telling an indecent story.

Stranger chance certainly never happened to any man than when the man who had so much delighted in jarring against the conventional proprieties of Oxford was all of a sudden turned into an Archbishop. He had been saying to a friend that he should have all he desired if he ever had £600 per annum independently of teaching. In a very few weeks he was left in Dublin one of the Lord Justices to administer the office of Viceroy during the absence of the Lord Lieutenant. We believe all that he says, that he had never asked, and would never have asked, anything of any Government; that however he might be flattered at the offer, he felt the actual office nothing but a burden; that he resolved to do his duty in his new station without regard to man. He continued the same. The dignified clergy were amazed when he called out from the top of the dinner-table, on some state occasion, "What is the vocative of cat?" and, obtaining no answer, said, "Why, puss, to be sure." Or when he quoted the verses—

"Old Daddy Longlegs won't say his prayers;
Take him by the left leg, and throw him down stairs!"—

as a proof that the English people were bred up from the nursery in the theory and practice of religious persecution;* or when, being about to preach, he sat during the service at the Communion-table of a Dublin church, pouncing with his fingers at the flies which surrounded him, sometimes with and sometimes without success; or when, being asked to consecrate a church, he attended as usual, and when it came to his turn to speak, said he was not going to do anything of the sort, as they expected, but only to sign the deeds which secured its being set aside for religious purposes; or when he amused himself by practising the boomerang in Stephen's Green. Such and many more were the stories which used to come back to us from across the Channel, and which those who knew Whately at Oxford were not slow to believe. Whether Whately had ever been able to whistle, we cannot undertake to decide, but if he had, he would have convinced Mr. Trollope that he is quite mistaken in his opinion that the ceremony of consecration deprives all bishops of the power. Whether anything was or was not dignified was, we sincerely believe, a doubt which never so much as crossed his mind. We are heartily sorry that Miss Whately has felt herself precluded by filial reverence from recording any of his characteristic sayings and doings, in which "the man" was a great deal more displayed than in a large part of the correspondence she has given us, interesting as it is.

Well may we pray not to be led into temptation. An Irish bishopric was the last situation which those who most loved and honoured Whately would have chosen for him. Many questions were naturally raised at the time by a nomination so unlikely. He had never in his life crossed the Channel, and it seemed, to say the least, strange that a man who had hitherto acted only as an Oxford tutor should be promoted at a jump to an archiepiscopal throne. That he never asked it, either directly or indirectly, we did not need to be told. He had, however, only just before been in close correspondence with his favourite pupil Senior, whom he was urging to publish a pamphlet advocating the alienation of the Church revenues from the Irish Establishment (whether wholly or in part does not appear), and the application of them to the payment of the Catholic clergy. To the objection that the Catholic clergy would refuse the money, he replied, that it had never been

* This was a favourite saying of Lord Macaulay's. We should really like to know which of the two borrowed it from the other, or whether, as we incline to think, it was original in both.

offered, and urged that if he were to go into a ball-room, and say, "Any young lady who wishes to be married, hold up her hand," he would find no hands held up. He said also that it was an act of justice, not to the priests but to the nation. It is very probable that some report of these letters reached Lord Grey through some "friend of a friend," and suggested the idea that the writer might be a useful man to support a plan which must already have been under consideration. The writer can speak to having seen a letter written by Lord Brougham (at the time Lord Chancellor) to a private friend, in which he mentioned the promotion of Whately and two other persons as an object he had especially in view. He is likely enough to have used his influence. Be this as it may, Lord Grey certainly nominated him not only without any conditions, but having never spoken to him, corresponded with him, nor (to the best of his knowledge) seen him. This fact, honourable to both parties, was deposed to by Lord Grey himself before the Committee on the Irish education system. It appears also, that Whately, of his own accord and without any suggestion, direct or indirect, offered to give up during his own life any part of his revenue which the Government might think it desirable to divert to other purposes.

These facts make us ready to believe that there was nothing in his conduct as Archbishop inconsistent with the views which he had pressed Senior to urge while he was still at Oxford. We find, indeed, that when the payment of tithes was opposed all over Ireland, he urged upon the Government to accept the alternative of civil war in its defence, and even promised, in case of their refusal, to join a voluntary association to defend the tithes by force. It is likely, indeed, that Senior's plan only contemplated a partial disendowment, and his support of the appropriation clause in the Whig tithe-bill proves that, even as Archbishop, he supported so much. Still, Senior's proposal must have gone much farther than the measure actually proposed by the Whigs, because he wished to take from the endowments of the Protestant Church enough to maintain the Catholic priests of Ireland, for which purpose the revenue gained by the appropriation clause would have been absurdly inadequate. We cannot help thinking, therefore, that the Archbishop was for retaining much of the wealth of the Establishment, which the Principal of St. Alban's Hall was for sweeping away. He repeatedly assumes, for instance, that the Protestant Church ought to keep enough to support an educated man in places where there are, *e.g.*, fifty Protestants. He does not seem to have asked himself why it has a right to this, if the Catholic Church has not the same right.

He was offended at the absurdity of men who fancied that the Reformers were for toleration. He says:—

Our Reformers never dreamed of liberty of conscience ; of not enforcing that which is part of the law of the land. But into this inconsistency their successors have fallen, by blending the two incompatible ideas of national religion and toleration. A departure from any of the institutions of the State is an offence against the State, and ought to be visited with secular penalties. *We* are like the physician who first prescribed ice, and then ordered that it should be warmed. We reverence the Reformers so much, that we allow them to put peas into our shoes, but take the liberty to boil them.

In another place :—

The unpersecuting spirit of our Church is only that of (I wish I could say all) her individual members ; no declaration was ever made by our Church as a body, that it is unchristian to inflict secular coercion and punishment on professors of a false religion. A man who should hold, as Bishop Jewel and others of our Reformers did, the right and duty of putting down heresy by civil penalties (though I should think him so far an unenlightened Christian), might be an unimpeachable member of our Church. He might defy you to show anything against him in the Articles ; and if you appealed to the Canons, you would find them all on his side. Whether a man be Papist or Protestant in name, let him beware chiefly of Old Adam.

Neither was he, like so many Protestants, wholly forgetful that the Irish have natural feelings as well as other people. He says :—

The establishment of a Protestant Church in Ireland, which is spoken of by many thoughtless Liberals and designing demagogues as a burden to the Irish nation, and which the ultra-Protestants speak of as nothing at all to be complained of by the mass of the people, should be viewed, though no burden, yet as a grievance, as being an insult. The real burden to the Roman Catholic population is one which they are not accustomed to complain of as such,—the maintenance of their own priests. And in like manner the Orangemen have been accustomed to defend the insult, on the ground that it is no injury, and the injury on the ground that it is no insult. If you cut off three-fourths of the revenues, and then three-fourths of the remainder, you would not have advanced one step towards conciliation, as long as the Protestant Church is called the National Church. The members of our communion here should be a branch of the English Church, just as there is one in India, or in any other of our foreign possessions. No one talks of the "Church of India," or of the "United Church of England, Ireland, and India." And there is no jealousy or displeasure excited, as there probably would be if the Hindoos and Mussulmans and Parsees and Roman Catholic Christians, &c., were told that ours was the National Church of their country. In advocating Catholic emancipation and the payment of the priests (not as puzzle-headed bigots are accustomed to say, by a Protestant Government, but

out of the revenues of a nation partly Protestant and partly Romish, revenues to which both contribute, and in which both have a right to an equitable share), I and others who thought with me were considered as half Papists or Latitudinarians, &c. (vol. ii. p. 458).

No one can doubt the importance of this; but he should have remarked that the principle of making the Established the National Church, though a great insult, is much more than an insult. It is carried out to a thousand logical consequences, which are most serious practical grievances; as, *e.g.*, in the rule that foundlings and abandoned children are to be brought up as Protestants, even in parts of the country where the whole population is Catholic: and again, that in those parts the Protestant chaplain in gaols and unions is paid at public expense, even though there are no inmates of his religion, because he represents the National Church. It is a pity that many of Whately's writings are given, like this, without date. It seems as if, when he had been longer Archbishop, he became gradually stronger in his support of the Irish Establishment; thus in 1847 he denounces his own former plan:—

I suppose—and—would do their best to prevent [the payment of the Irish priests] except in the way of taking the funds from the Protestant Establishment; a plan than which Satan himself could not devise a more effectual one for keeping up and exasperating the animosities of this wretched country.

Of the date of this important change of opinion we are told nothing. About the same time he remarks:—

Anything of conciliation has a far better effect when not extorted. Some people reproach the Roman Catholics for not being grateful for emancipation. I always thought them rather over-grateful to O'Connell; but as for the Tory Ministry, to thank them for granting what they dared not refuse, would have justified the spelling of the word "great fool." You might as well thank an ox for a beef-steak (vol. ii. p. 91).

In 1841 he wrote from Ems in terms which imply a considerable apprehension of the master evil of Ireland:—

There are multitudes here of huge orange-coloured slugs. Shall I bring over some to fill sinecure places in Ireland?

To a person who compared Ireland to England, referring the contrast to religion, he wrote:—

To try what could be done for the deterioration of Protestants, you must suppose England again conquered by the Normans or some foreign people of a different religion, who seize on all the land, and take all the Church endowments for their own Church, leaving the mass of the population—all poor—to

maintain their own ministers on the voluntary system. And especially if this had been done three hundred years ago, when the English were far less civilized than now, what would they be at this day?

He speaks of "Lord John's most absurd Durham letter," and was against the equally absurd measure which followed it. His chief anxiety, however, was, that no bill should be passed which did not include Ireland as well as England. "What we the Irish Protestants have to do is, not to try to aggravate the rage in England, but to implore that we may be kept in the same boat. That is our only chance."

The measure in which he was most interested as Archbishop was the Irish National Education. We have here an immense correspondence about it. This man, who really believed himself to stand so entirely aloof from all parties, was always urging that the Government should not make any man a Protestant Bishop unless he was a supporter of that plan. Nothing could have been a more violent party measure; for the Protestant clergy who supported it were little more than a *clique* of his own followers. We have no space to follow in detail the history of the Education Board. Lord Derby's plan, as all the world knows, was that secular instruction should be given in mixed schools, but that no school should be aided by a government grant in which all Catholic children were not regularly taught their religion by their own priest, or in which any Protestant, whether schoolmaster or clergyman, or other person, was allowed to give them any sort or degree of religious teaching, whether more or less. By degrees, the plan was modified to meet Protestant objections. Two classes of schools were then established, and in those called non-vested the patron was allowed to teach what he liked, the only restraint being that he could not compel the attendance of any individual child upon his religious instruction, if its parents objected to it in writing. What great opportunities for proselytizing this change gave, no one can doubt. The Catholic Archbishop was very old, and had been educated in times when the persecution had hardly passed away. Dr. Whately came in the prime of life, and with a great power of work, and managed by degrees to get the thing almost entirely into his own hands. Especially, he drew up several religious books for use by Catholics as well as Protestants. At last Dr. Murray, the Catholic Archbishop, was succeeded by the present Archbishop, and he at once objected to Dr. Whately's religious books. The Government, as in duty and honour bound, gave way. Dr. Whately, after a most strenuous resistance, resigned his connection with the

board, on the professed ground that the removal of these books was a breach of faith to any persons who might have united their schools to the board while they were sanctioned. In this discussion he insisted, over and over again, that to concede this point was to abandon the *original principles* of the system. To remain on the Commission he declared would be to pretend he was carrying out "the system, when in reality he was subverting it." "The office I have hitherto held is in reality suppressed; and it would not be fair in me to deceive Parliament and the public, by pretending to go on carrying out the system, which, in truth, is fundamentally changed." We have marked as many passages of this kind as would fill several pages. He everywhere protests that his only desire was to carry out the original system on its original principles. We observe this with real regret, for in all these declarations we do not see how to acquit him of positive fraud. He must have known that the original principle (compared with which all others were only details) was, that the system should be free from the slightest suspicion of proselytism. If, therefore, he believed that the schools were practically turned to that purpose, he was bound in honour to have protested against the abuse, even if none of his colleagues had discovered it. Much more was he bound not to object to any change which would prevent it—more than all, not to object to such a change, on the ground that it was inconsistent with "the original system." In the letters printed by Miss Whately, there is no hint that his real object was consciously different from his professions. But she has, apparently by an oversight, admitted some passages of a journal kept by Mr. Senior on a visit to the Archbishop in 1852, which prove that he consciously and deliberately used the system for that purpose. He said:—

The education supplied by the National Board is gradually supplanting the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church . . . I believe that mixed education is gradually enlightening the mass of the people, and that if we give it up, we give up the only hope of weaning the Irish from the abuses of Popery. But I cannot venture openly to profess this opinion. I cannot openly support the Education Board as an instrument of conversion. I have to fight its battle with one hand, and that my best, tied behind me.

He adds that the religious books to which he had obtained Archbishop Murray's sanction, and to which Cardinal Cullen objected, were a special means of this "undermining," and that he had always expected it would be so, although Dr. Murray had failed to foresee it.

We heartily regret to be compelled to feel that in this

matter Dr. Whately was guilty of a "pious fraud" of a very gross order. In future those Catholics who object to the mixed system, and to his own religious works, can quote his authority. It was adopted, and we presume is still supported, in his own words, "as an instrument of conversion," by which he intended to "undermine the Irish Roman Catholic Church," "to wean the Irish from the abuses of Popery." Such language, we trust, will ever be borne in mind by those whom it concerns.

Another painful mark of gradual deterioration in the firmness of Whately's moral principles was the patronage which, in his later years, he was induced to give to the base system of pecuniary proselytizing in Ireland. In his earlier years he was opposed to it. In vol. i. p. 363, he gives several instances of the abandoned character of the pretended converts. He then said:—

My experience would have convinced me, had I doubted it, that some zealous Protestants are so eager for a convert, that they hastily take for granted a man's being a sincere Protestant if he does but echo all they say, and answer leading questions to their mind; when perhaps he is, as I have found in some cases, too ignorant (to waive all suspicion of deliberate falsehood) to be properly called either Roman Catholic or a Protestant, from his knowing, I may say, nothing of either the one religion or the other.

He was speaking especially of persons who pretended, falsely as he believed, to have been priests.

This was in 1836; some years later (apparently through the influence of the ladies of his family, who are well known to have taken a leading part in the detestable system) he was led into giving it his decided patronage. He gave Mr. Senior the strongest assurances that bribery is not used. We have seldom been under stronger temptation to adopt his own explanation, and say "he knew better." Possibly, however, he may have deceived himself. An Englishman is likely to judge of the poor of other countries by those of England; and it is seldom that an Englishman of the poorest class knows or cares enough about the differences between different religions to refuse for his child the offer of a comfortable, nay, abundant maintenance, and a future career in a very much higher social position than his own, on condition of his being educated in some particular "denomination." How detestable and wicked is the system of kidnapping infants by means of the "birdsnests," which is now associated in Ireland with the once honoured name of Whately, we need tell no one who has read an article in the *Month* for December, 1866. If there are any of our readers who have not read that article, we

would earnestly request them immediately to do so. As to adults, the system is no doubt less cruel. Its victims are responsible agents; and if they sell their souls under temptations, however great, they are themselves in fault, although less so than those who buy them. But as a matter of fact, it is notorious that, in the very poorest districts of Ireland, at the moments of greatest distress, any Catholic who will consent to call himself or herself a Protestant is certain to be well provided for, and in general to obtain a salary (as a schoolmaster or mistress, a Scripture-reader, district visitor, or under some such title) which places him as much above his former station in life as an income of a thousand a year would place most of our domestic servants. This system, in Dr. Whately's opinion, is not bribery. We presume he persuaded himself that all the converts would equally have become Protestants if they had expected that starvation, not plenty, would be the consequence. He probably was not aware, as we are, of cases in which persons of this class, drawing a salary of £100 a year, have come by night to a lay Catholic gentleman to express their earnest desire to escape to any other way of life if they could only get enough to keep them from actual starvation.

Dr. Whately wrote to Dr. Copleston:—

You have an inestimable advantage, so far as you are interested in Irish affairs, in being able to apply to one, of whom you are assured by an intimacy of above thirty years, that he is incapable, not only of wilful deceit, but also of speaking, as from knowledge, when he is only giving conjectures, and also aloof from all parties, and anxious to ascertain the truth.

It does not seem to have occurred to him that an English Protestant in Ireland is, from the necessity of his position, a member of a party; and that an Englishman placed in an Irish Protestant archbishopric is, by his position, the spirit of party personified. How totally an able man may be blinded by party spirit, while he fancies he sees, Dr. Whately strikingly exemplified.

We have said nothing of his parliamentary career, nor of his exertions to procure the abolition of transportation, which he said he had been "specially sent into the world to oppose;" nor have we had space to follow him into his daily private life, of which his daughter gives a very interesting but short account.

He died at the age of seventy-six, after having held the see of Dublin two-and-thirty years. His mind was always active; he was ever striving to spread what he believed to be the truth, and yet we greatly doubt whether either in England or

Ireland any religious effect of his labours even now remains. In theology his school is gone by. We much doubt whether there is one man who both follows his methods and is satisfied with his conclusions. Many who once looked up to him as a guide are now Catholics or "ritualists"; many more have abandoned all definite religious belief. Even those who would most willingly call themselves of his school, look back to his theological teaching as an inconsistency. His intellectual is greater than his religious influence. His clear logic, his remarkable power of illustration, his undoubtedly full conviction of all he taught, must make his works interesting as long as they are read at all. His power of illustration in particular was not only very great, but also singular in kind. It is never poetical; it never throws a halo of light and beauty over any idea, or makes the visible world a shadow of the invisible. His illustrations are always employed to make his meaning clearer, and for that purpose they have a force and life which we do not remember to have seen surpassed, if indeed it has been equalled. Sometimes they are humorous, as when he compares a committee of nine for the reform of the university statutes (of which he was a member) to the nine muses, "who are always * painted singing all at one time, on nine different themes."

* This word is, in the book, "*printed*." We never remember to have read a book in which mistakes of this kind (one word which nearly makes sense being substituted for another) were so common. These seem to be errors of transcription, not of the press. They should be corrected in a second edition. Among very many more we have "latter" for "letter," "possess" for "profess," "firmly" for "fairly," and the slaveowners in America are amusingly described as sending free blacks to "Siberia," where Liberia is evidently meant.

ART. II.—THE RELATIONS OF S. PAUL WITH S. PETER.

The First Age of Christianity and the Church. By JOHN IGNATIUS DOLLINGER, D.D. Translated by HENRY NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, M.A. London: Allen.

S. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. A revised text, with Introduction, Notes, and Illustrations. By J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge: Macmillan.

IN a later article of our present number, we defend against Dr. Pusey the Catholic doctrine of Ecclesiastical Unity. As a foundation of our argument, we draw attention to one fact, so transparently evident on the surface of history, that no one has ever dreamed of calling it in question. The first Christians considered themselves as having received a Divine command, (1) to accept as infallible truth the Apostolic preaching; and (2) to form themselves into one society, under unreserved submission to the Apostolic government. No one, therefore, who believes that Christianity is from God, has ever denied that the Apostles did, in fact, receive this twofold commission; and yet Protestants have at times put forth various statements concerning S. Paul, which would lead by immediate consequence to a directly contrary conclusion. They have implied, *e. g.*, that S. Peter fell into this or that doctrinal mistake, which S. Paul corrected; and, again, that the latter claimed the right of legislating for his own converts, quite independently of the earlier Apostles. Yet the former of these implications is simply an implication that S. Peter was not doctrinally infallible; while from the latter it would at once ensue, that the Church of the Apostles did not constitute one body politic, but, on the contrary, was composed of distinct and independent societies. No Protestant could directly maintain either of these two conclusions; but it is not on that account the less important, carefully to examine those phenomena on which his premisses rest. Then, further, in our next number we are to maintain against Dr. Pusey that S. Peter was not merely an Apostle, but the chief of the Apostles; possessing by divine right a certain authority over the rest: and it will be obviously convenient, therefore, to take the present opportunity for examining those

particulars in S. Paul's history which Protestants allege against the Catholic doctrine.

The text of the New Testament is common ground between our opponents and ourselves; and in examining it for the purpose in hand, we shall derive great assistance from the two works which we have named at the head of our article. When Mr. Oxenham's translation first appeared, while rendering full justice to the singular merits of Dr. Döllinger's work, we expressed at length our sense of what appeared to us its serious defects (July, 1866, pp. 247—251): but in the present article it will be our more pleasing task to deal almost exclusively with points on which we cordially concur with the learned writer. Dr. Lightfoot's Commentary displays a most unusual amount of learning, ability, and candour; and we are very happy to add, that the principles advocated or implied throughout are those of the more orthodox among Protestants.

It so happens that in every case the Protestant disparagement of S. Peter turns on that great doctrine of Christianity, which declares the Ceremonial Law to be utterly abolished. We must begin, therefore, with a brief reference to that doctrine. We do not, of course, profess to treat it with any kind of completeness; but only just so far as is necessary, for appreciating the relationship between S. Peter and S. Paul. According, then, to the view universally received in the Church from the time of S. Augustine, the case stands thus:—The Jewish Ceremonial Law ceased to be obligatory, whenever and wherever the Gospel Law was sufficiently promulgated. From the very day of Pentecost, so soon as the Gospel was sufficiently promulgated to the Jews in any place, the Ceremonial Law ceased to bind them. Yet, on the other hand, for several years, as theologians express it, it was not *deadly* although *dead*. That is, though the Jews were not *bound* to practise it, yet they were fully permitted to do so. There were two different reasons for this. Firstly, as Dr. Döllinger observes, so long as the Jewish polity and "Temple stood it was idle to think of abolishing the Law; or at least its abolition could only have come about through a general and simultaneous entrance of the Jewish nation, as well its lower as its higher classes, into the Church. For the ceremonial was also a civil law; the Jew was bound to its observance not only as an individual, but above all as a member of the state and nation; nor was there any command of the Lord to the individual believer, to separate from his people and its Church and State organization. Moreover, in Judæa and Galilee it was impossible to do so without emigrating. . . Thus it was not left to the caprice of the believers in Judæa whether they would

observe the Ceremonial Law or not, but was for them a necessity" (vol. i. p. 84). Then, secondly and subordinately, the Jews were in general so obstinately attached to their ritual, that the attempt suddenly and without preparation to have required its abandonment, would have placed a very serious obstacle to their reception of the Gospel. The Apostles, consequently, not only did not command a Jewish convert to abstain from practising the Ceremonial Law; they practised it themselves, for the most part, punctually and diligently. And they carefully abstained from promulgating the doctrine that its obligation had ceased.

And yet no one who accepts the New Testament can successfully maintain, that after the day of Pentecost they ever regarded this Law and the Jewish Temple-service as permanent institutions; or as constituting an integral part of Christianity. On the one hand it is absolutely incredible that our Lord should have concealed from *them*, what he declared to the Samaritan woman (John iv. 21); not to mention His prophecy on the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple (Matt. xxiv. 2, &c.): and the Holy Ghost, be it observed (John xiv. 26), recalled to their memory whatever He had spoken. On the other hand, as a matter of fact, it is absolutely certain that, some time before S. Peter's Cornelius-vision, the essentially transient character of the Jewish polity was publicly preached by Christians; since it was this very doctrine for which S. Stephen was martyred.* The being merely told that

* Acts vi. 13, 14:—"Statuerunt falsos testes qui dicerent 'homo iste non cessat loqui verba adversus locum sanctum et legem; audivimus enim eum dicentem quoniam Jesus Nazarenus hic destruet locum istum, et mutabit traditiones quas tradidit nobis Moyses.'" Dr. Lightfoot beyond doubt is substantially correct in his remark (p. 281) that "the accused attempts no denial, but pleads a justification." Had the charge been simply destitute of all foundation, S. Stephen's defence would have been, that he revered the Temple and the Law as absolutely and unreservedly as any Hebrew present; but no imaginable analysis of his speech can represent this as its drift. See *c. g. vii. 47, 48*:—"Salomon autem ædificavit illi domum, sed non Excelsus in manufactis habitat." That is, to use à Lapide's paraphrase, "Be not proud because of your Temple and its Jewish rites, as though they were to be perpetual, &c." To the same effect Tirinus: "If anything pricked the Jews to the heart, this last comment concerning the Temple, as though it were not so dear to God, roused them all to the height of frenzy." In what respect, then, were S. Stephen's accusers "false witnesses"? "They perhaps said nothing but truth," says Calmet (ad Act. vi. 13, 14), "in maintaining that [according to S. Stephen] Jesus had said that the Temple should be destroyed and the ceremonies of the Mosaic Law abolished. But they spoke falsely in saying that [according to S. Stephen] Jesus would *Himself* destroy the Temple." Similarly, Menochius. The charge was further and more importantly false, as Dr. Lightfoot truly remarks (p. 281), in that it totally "misrepresents the spirit which animated S. Stephen's teaching." There can be no doubt that he

at some future unknown period Jewish ceremonialism would cease, was of course indefinitely less startling and repulsive to Jewish believers, than the notion that, while the Temple-services remained in full celebration, any children of Abraham could be dispensed from their frequentation and practice. The Apostles meanwhile were mainly occupied in imbuing their flock with a morality which was new to very many, and a Faith which was new to all; they were speaking of God's Eternal Son and Life-giving Spirit; of redemption, faith, and grace. It probably did not occur to them, before the case of Cornelius, even to consider the question whether the time was come for making that important change which was inaugurated by his reception into the Church. Nor, be it remembered, did the prevalent restriction, even at that early period, operate necessarily in the way of exclusion; because every human being had full liberty of becoming a proselyte to the Mosaic Law.*

We are not aware that Protestants in general will demur to any portion of the above sketch; though they represent S. Peter as more or less confused and uncertain, as to one or two further truths built by God on this foundation. Our most convenient course, then, will be to trace, under Dr. Lightfoot's guidance, the successive stages along which the Church proceeded, in applying to practice the fundamental Christian doctrine, that no believer is obliged to comply with the Jewish Ceremonial Law. At each successive stage, we will consider the position assumed by S. Peter and the earlier Apostles.

The first disciples consisted of four classes: (1) those who were Jewish by descent and lived in Judæa; (2) those who were Jewish by descent, but who were dispersed over the world, though in the habit of visiting Jerusalem for the Pasch; (3) those who were descended from "proselytes;" and (4) those who were themselves proselytes. All these were circumcised, and kept the whole Ceremonial Law; yet the Hebrews

referred most reverently to the Temple and Ceremonial Law, as having been of Divine institution. But whereas he also preached that they had not been instituted as *permanent*, he was falsely charged with "speaking against" them. Cf. the "false witnesses" against our Lord.

* Suarez, in his "*de Legibus*" (l. 9, c. 15-20) draws out most powerfully the full doctrine as to the Ceremonial Law, becoming firstly "*mortua*" and afterwards "*mortifera*." He assumes throughout, as a matter of course, that the Apostles knew from the very day of Pentecost the cessation of its obligatoriness. He does not, however, advert at all to that necessity of observing it, which resulted (as Dr. Dollinger points out) from the law of the land. Moreover, Suarez himself inclines to name a considerably earlier period than the destruction of the Temple, as the epoch at which it became "*mortifera*." We cannot ourselves follow him in this particular.

proper had ever regarded the "Hellenists"* with suspicion and distrust. "As the number of disciples increased" (Acts vi. 1), this mutual estrangement found an entrance into the Church; and it happened, either that the interest of the Hellenist widows was comparatively neglected in the daily distribution of alms, or else that the Hellenists themselves unjustly suspected this. The Apostles (v. 4) desiring to apply themselves without distraction to their more spiritual duties, begged the brethren at large to select seven deacons for the care of the poor. "All the names of the seven" thus selected "are Greek, pointing to a Hellenist rather than a Hebrew extraction; and one," Nicolaus, "is especially described as a proselyte, being doubtless chosen to represent a hitherto small but growing section of the community." (Lightfoot, p. 280.) Even in this fact, we find S. Peter and his co-Apostles steadily resisting any undue pre-eminence of that class to which they themselves belonged.

Next follows the martyrdom of S. Stephen, one of the seven, for proclaiming the transitory character of the Temple and the Ceremonial Law. Nothing can be plainer than that the Apostles and whole Christian body considered themselves absolutely identified with S. Stephen's cause. He had but proclaimed what the Apostles commissioned him to proclaim.

"The indirect consequences of his martyrdom extend far beyond the immediate effect of his dying words. A persecution 'arose about Stephen.' The disciples of the mother Church 'were scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judæa and Samaria (viii. 1).' Some of the refugees even 'travelled as far as Phœnice and Cyprus and Antioch (xi. 19).' This dispersion was, as we shall see, the parent of the first Gentile congregation. The Church of the Gentiles, it may be truly said, was baptized in the blood of Stephen." (Lightfoot, p. 281.) "The great persecution in Jerusalem dispersed most of the believers over the provinces of Judæa and Samaria, and even drove them further to Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Antioch. *That the Apostles, who were chiefly threatened, remained at Jerusalem, showed that they had received a special command of Christ to do so.*" (Döllinger, p. 68.)

We now arrive at an extremely important step in the Church's

* "The Hellenists were the Grecian Jews: not only those who were themselves proselytes,—not only those who came of families once proselytized,—but all who, on account of origin or habitation, spoke Greek as their ordinary language, and used ordinarily the Septuagint version."—(Alford ad Acts vi. 1.) It is to be regretted that the Vulgate uses the same word, "Greci," for such different classes as the Ἑλληνισταὶ and the Ἕλληνες.

† Acts viii. 1—7; xi. 19.

denationalization; the conversion of Samaria. "The Samaritan occupied the border land between the Jew and the Gentile. Theologically, as geographically, he was the connecting link between the one and the other. Half Hebrew by race, half Israelite in the acceptance of a portion of the sacred canon, he held an anomalous position, shunning and shunned by the Jew, yet clinging to the same promises and looking forward to the same hopes." (Lightfoot, p. 282.) How did the Apostles receive the intelligence, that multitudes of these men had received Baptism? with disapprobation? with misgiving? On the contrary—since Philip had not the power of imparting the visible gifts of the Holy Ghost—the Apostles at once commissioned SS. Peter and John to ratify and complete the holy work which Philip had begun. (Acts viii. 14—17.)

Matters at length became ripe for a still more important and significant movement; the admission of Gentiles as such into the one fold, without any necessity for their taking the intermediate step, and becoming proselytes to Judaism. If we may so speak, God inaugurated this great epoch by a solemn ceremonial; nor did He assign to S. Peter the mere task of approving and completing what had been done by a subordinate, but, on the contrary, of himself beginning, carrying through, and accomplishing the inaugural act. He learned by a vision (Acts x. 10—16), that the appointed time was now come; that whereas under the old Covenant "the Supreme Lawgiver had marked out and given for food only certain classes of animals" (Döllinger, p. 71), the time was now come when all animals were indifferently to be eaten within the borders of the Church.* Then entered the messengers of

* Dr. Döllinger apparently considers (p. 72) that S. Peter did not know, before this vision, even so much as this; viz., that the Ceremonial Law was no permanent and integral portion of Christianity. Not here to dwell on other extremely strong grounds of objection against this opinion, it is surely altogether irreconcilable (1) with S. Stephen's preaching, and (2) with S. Peter's own approval of the Samaritan conversions. S. Peter's words, indeed (Acts x. 34, 35), are understood by Dr. Döllinger as imposing this view; but, we are convinced, untruly. S. Peter says, "In veritate comperi (ἐπ' ἀληθείας καταλαμβάνομαι) quia non est personarum acceptor Deus; sed in omni gente qui timet Eum et operatur justitiam acceptus est Illi;" which Dr. Döllinger understands as meaning, "Now for the first time I discover, &c." But (1) how monstrously unworthy the supposition, that an inspired Apostle can have been commissioned to teach on faith and grace, without knowing so elementary a truth as that all truly good men are acceptable to God: moreover (2) Dr. Döllinger strangely forgets, that the very Apostolic commission was "Euntes docete omnes gentes." On coming to the facts of this particular case, Dr. Döllinger's mistake is equally evident. It is simply impossible that S. Peter could express himself as having at that moment discovered that men of all nations are admitted into

Cornelius, who had himself been favoured with a similar vision ; and S. Peter, now understanding the significance of what he had seen, gladly accompanied them. "And now followed an occurrence which could not but remove the last lingering scruples of S. Peter's Jewish attendants ; God Himself showed that He had made these Gentiles members of Christ, independently of the ministry of the Apostle who was summoned for the purpose. For, before they were baptized and had received the laying on of hands, while they were listening to S. Peter's words, the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spoke with tongues and praised God. Thus was the same privilege accorded to the first fruits of the Gentiles which had been the glory of the first fruits of Israel at Pentecost. They were at once baptized by Peter's direction ; and thus God had Himself reversed in some sense the usual order of His grace, by bestowing on the unbaptized the gifts of the Holy Ghost. . . . When the believers at Jerusalem received Peter with reproaches for having associated and eaten with the uncircumcised, he justified himself by simply relating what had occurred, which showed clearly the immediate interposition of God, and by reminding them of Christ's promise, that His followers should be baptized with the Holy Ghost, which was here fulfilled." (Döllinger, pp. 72, 73.) They received his account of what had passed with great gladness and thanksgiving. Nothing had occurred to give them any suspicion, that *the children of Abraham* were no longer bound by the Ceremonial Law ; they

the Church : for even an *Æthiopian* had just been received (Acts viii. 38) ; and one of the very deacons was a proselyte. Secondly, as Dean Alford (*ad locum*) points out, S. Peter is referring to three passages of Scripture, Deut. x. 17 ; 2 Paralip. xix. 7 ; Job xxxiv. 19 ; where it is said that God does not accept persons. Could S. Peter have meant "now for the first time I believe what Scripture says" ? Nor can we see any verbal difficulty in understanding the words, with Calmet, "I now experience what I already speculatively knew ;" or, again, with Dean Alford, "I grasp by experience the truth of what Scripture declares." We would suggest some such paraphrase as this : "In this vision I apprehend (or recognize) nothing less, than that great truth declared in Scripture, &c." The Vulgate, by translating "*comperio*," instead of "*comperio*," seems to protest against the interpretation which we are opposing.

We should further add, that Dr. Döllinger greatly increases his own difficulty by supposing (p. 68) that the converted *Æthiopian* was only a "*proselyte of the gate*"—i. e., a person in every respect similarly circumstanced with Cornelius himself. Had this been so, Dr. Döllinger's view would not be unreasonable only, but quite without meaning, that S. Peter did not, before his vision, know the admissibility of such persons into the Church. But we cannot ourselves doubt that the *Æthiopian* was an observer of the whole Ceremonial Law ; a "*proselyte of righteousness*."—See Isa. lvi. 3-5.

only discovered, and rejoiced to discover, that Gentiles could now freely enter the Church, without being checked by any previous obligation of becoming proselytes to Judaism.

Very soon afterwards a still further step was taken. Cornelius was a pious Monotheist, and a believer in the Old Testament ; but at Antioch a multitude of idolatrous Gentiles were converted (Acts xi. 20).^{*} In what spirit did the Apostles receive this new intelligence ? They at once sent down S. Barnabas (v. 22), who, acting under the instructions he had received, took the best means in his power to consolidate and edify this infant Gentile Church. No unprejudiced person would dream of otherwise understanding the sacred narrative. Dean Alford, however, whose great general services as a Scripture commentator we are far from undervaluing, gives so truly extraordinary a turn to the whole circumstance,

^{*} There is some little dispute here about the facts, on which a few words may be in place. Is the word in v. 20 *Ἕλληνες* or *ἑλληνισταὶ* ? The Vulgate throws no light on the question, because it translates both these words by the same name "Græci." Both à Lapide and Calmet understand the verse as referring to idolatrous Gentiles ; nor do we see how the context admits of any doubt. At first the Word was preached by the dispersed Christians "to none except Jews alone" (v. 19) ; whereas in Antioch it was afterwards also preached to the "Græci." Now, no one can suppose that at first it was preached to a *narrower* class, than at Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost ; hence at Antioch afterwards it was preached to a *larger* class. The "Græci," therefore, were not Hellenists ; and, if not Hellenists, they were idolatrous Gentiles.

The great objection against this obvious view is the impossibility of supposing that such an event can have taken place before the conversion of Cornelius. And no one indeed, who accepts the New Testament, can reasonably admit that that conversion would have been attended with so much of miracle and of ceremonial, had *idolatrous Gentiles* been already reclaimed and received into the Church. But on what possible ground are the events of Acts xi. 20 to be placed before Cornelius's conversion ? As soon as they took place, they must have been reported at Jerusalem ; as soon as they were reported, the Apostles sent S. Barnabas to Antioch (v. 22) ; when he arrived at Antioch, S. Paul was at Tarsus (v. 25) ; and S. Paul did not arrive at Tarsus till more than three years after his conversion (Gal. i. 18 ; Acts ix. 30). The obvious interpretation, then, of these events is as follows. After S. Stephen's martyrdom, many Christians spent much time in Cyprus, Phœnicæ, and Antioch, preaching to those of the Circumcision. In due time intelligence arrived of Cornelius's conversion and its attendant circumstances. Now, if a *pious Monotheist* could be received into the Church without first becoming a Jewish proselyte, an *idolatrous Gentile* might also be received into the Church on due conditions : for in the very process of his conversion he must rise to Cornelius's original position, that of a pious Monotheist. Certain zealous Cyprians and Cyreneans then saw that this principle was involved in what S. Peter had done, and proceeded at once to preach with great success to the idolatrous Gentiles at Antioch. And it is most intelligible that, Hellenists as they probably were, they should be much quicker than Hebrews to discern the full significance of S. Peter's act.

that we can only attribute his hallucination to the unconscious influence of Protestant and anti-Petrine prejudice. He says (on Acts xi. 21) that the Apostles probably sent S. Barnabas "to *deter* these persons from admitting the uncircumcised into the Church." And what reason does the learned author assign for so strange a paradox? He says it is implied in vv. 23, 24, that S. Barnabas on his arrival found the state of Antioch most different from what he had expected. We fancy no one except the Dean would have dreamed of any such implication; but let us, for argument's sake, concede it. Under S. Barnabas's supposed circumstances, what would have been the conduct of any ordinarily conscientious man? He would at once have returned to the Apostles, reported his experience, and begged for fresh instructions. But, according to the Dean, he at once resolved on a course precisely opposed to that which he had been ordered to adopt, and brought S. Paul to Antioch as the best coadjutor he could find in his perfidy and rebellion. Nay, Dean Alford thinks that the sacred historian, in the very act of describing so shameful a scandal, described its perpetrator (v. 24) as "a good man and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith." Dr. Lightfoot is unhappily not a Catholic, but he is possessed of common sense; and he gives the obvious view of this whole transaction, by saying that, "*at the bidding of the Apostles*, Barnabas seeks out Saul in his retirement at Tarsus, and brings him to Antioch" (p. 285).

We find, then, that the whole comprehensiveness of the Church—down to her very reception of idolatrous Gentiles—was wrought either by the direct agency of the earlier Apostles, or at least under their direction and most hearty co-operation; and further, that it was wrought before S. Paul had even become an Apostle.

We now turn our attention to the illustrious Doctor of the Gentiles. The original commission given to the Apostles was, "*Euntes, docete omnes gentes;*" yet S. Paul was chosen at a later period by God Himself, for the purpose of fulfilling that precept in a far more important and permanent way than all the rest put together. To fit him for his office, God gave him his profound knowledge of the Faith by immediate revelation, and through no agency whatever of the earlier Apostles. Moreover, God raised him up for the purpose of watching with special jealousy against any practical infraction of that great principle of Gospel liberty, which was so necessary for the success of his peculiar mission. Yet,—though such was his high vocation, and though he was himself throughout most keenly

conscious how great a trust God had committed to his keeping,—no careful student of his history will find the slightest trace of what so many Protestants suppose; the slightest trace of his claiming either (1) any superiority of doctrinal knowledge over S. Peter and the rest, or (2) any power of government independent of his union with *them*. He co-operated with them in teaching the *whole* Church, in governing the *whole* Church; he never dreamed of individually teaching and governing a special Pauline Church of his own.

Indeed from the first God carefully provided against any idea, that S. Paul's exceptional *vocation* implied any exceptional ecclesiastical *position*. Christ did not Himself baptize him, as He baptized the earlier Apostles; but sent Ananias, an humble and unknown member of the Church, to minister that sacrament (Acts ix. 18). Ananias, at the same time, informed him in general terms (Acts xxii. 15) of those general circumstances in his future career, which Ananias had himself learned from Christ (Acts ix. 15). The new convert at once simply united himself with the other Christians of Damascus, and preached Jesus, while he was permitted, in the synagogue of the city. "Not for long however—that the Jews at Damascus, where they had full power against an apostate from their own ranks, would not have tolerated." Nor, indeed, was it God's design that he should at once plunge into those active labours, which were to be the main business of his life. When driven from Damascus, he "did not return to Jerusalem, but went into Arabia" (Gal. i. 17): "not to preach there, but to prepare in solitary intercourse with God for the duties of his future life, to obtain through converse with his glorified Redeemer that fitness for the Apostolate, which the other Apostles had gained from their converse with Christ on earth" (Döllinger, p. 77). Nor can we doubt that during that whole period he was constantly growing, in deeper knowledge and apprehension of that Gospel which he was to proclaim. At length, however, the needful time of preparation was accomplished; he resumed his labours at Damascus for a brief space;* and when driven thence, three years after his conversion (Gal. i. 18), by the Jewish conspiracy against him (Acts ix. 23), his very first task (Acts ix. 26; Gal. i. 18) was to put himself into communication with S. Peter, the Church's visible head. Observe, also, the strength of the word "*ιστορήσαι*" (Gal. i. 18), for which "*videre*" is but an inadequate version. The word, says Dr. Lightfoot (*ad loc.*),

* The "*dies multi*" of Acts ix. 23 includes, of course, his long stay in Arabia.

"is somewhat emphatic; 'a word used,' says Chrysostom, 'by those who go to see great and famous cities.' " He went then to visit Peter, as wishing to make acquaintance with the Church's most illustrious member. And whereas modern infidels say that the Acts were written for the purpose of giving an unduly Petrine colour to S. Paul's history, it is not a little remarkable that it is from his own Epistle, and not from the Acts, that we learn what was his chief motive at this period in repairing to Jerusalem.

We find, however, from the latter work, that he earnestly sought to be identified with the other Christians of Jerusalem; and that whatever repulsion or suspicion existed, came entirely from their side (Acts ix. 26). There seems, indeed, every reason to think that his intention at that time was to remain at Jerusalem, labouring under SS. Peter and James, until they should see good to employ him in more distant missions: but when the Hellenistic Jews sought his life (ix. 29), the other Christians themselves recommended a departure to his native Tarsus. At the same time (Acts xxii. 17—21), he was also admonished by Christ, in a vision, to leave Jerusalem; and to hold himself in readiness for a future mission, which should not be to the Jews but to the Gentiles. He would learn more definitely from that vision, than from Ananias's previous announcement, the precise nature of that work to which he was destined; and he proceeded at once to Tarsus, having remained in Jerusalem only fifteen days (Gal. i. 18). During his brief stay at Tarsus he seems to have remained wholly inactive, awaiting the promised summons. Up to this period, then, at all events,—true though it is that, having learned the Gospel from God, he needed and received no human instruction,—it is no less true, that no man would have been more simply loyal and submissive to the Apostles.

At Tarsus there very soon reached him that Apostolic commission, brought by S. Barnabas, to which we have already referred. S. Peter and the rest well knew that he had been specially chosen for evangelizing the Gentiles; and they discerned, in the new movement at Antioch, that very scope which was most suited to his graces and endowments. S. Barnabas, a Cyprian, was also singularly well adapted for the same work; and the two friends, assisted by a body of zealous co-operators, reaped a very large harvest of souls in the space of one year (Acts xi. 26). At that time they returned for a brief space to Jerusalem, bringing with them large pecuniary help from the new Gentile community to their Jewish fellow-Christians, who were suffering from famine; and thus expressing their sense of complete religious brotherhood. It seems, how-

ever, pretty certain, from S. Paul's subsequent language (Gal. ii. 1), that no Apostle happened to be in Jerusalem at that particular time. (See Dr. Lightfoot, p. 113.) They returned speedily to Antioch, taking back with them S. Barnabas's nephew S. Mark (Acts xii. 25).

At this period of S. Paul's history took place his elevation to the Apostolate. This appointment undoubtedly did not come from S. Peter and the others; because, as Dr. Döllinger truly remarks (p. 82), they had received no power from God to create a new Apostle. Yet as though for the purpose of more carefully impressing on him his indissoluble connection with the existing Church, and so with the earlier Apostles,—his appointment seems not to have been directly notified to him by the Holy Ghost, but only through the intermediate agency of certain Antiochene prophets and doctors (Acts xiii. 1). S. Barnabas was at the same time raised to the Apostolic office. From this time the special connection of SS. Paul and Barnabas with the local Church of Antioch came to an end; and moreover, instead of being *commissioned* by (or, as Catholics would now say, receiving *jurisdiction* from) the Apostles, they were themselves members of the Apostolic body. They at once undertook a missionary journey to Cyprus and the southern provinces of Asia Minor, which had great results, but which has no bearing on our present question. It is only necessary to remind the reader, that S. Paul now began what remained throughout his undeviating custom; viz., that of preaching in every place to the Jews, before he proceeded to address the Gentiles. On his return, however, to Antioch began the most critical period of his Christian life.

Before entering on the history of this momentous crisis, it will be necessary to recount briefly the various forms of Judaizing error which then existed. And in the first place very many thoroughly loyal children of the Church fully believed that *they*, as being Jews, were under an obligation of observing the Ceremonial Law. Such were those "thousands" mentioned by S. James to S. Paul (Acts xxi. 20), who were "zealots for the law." The Apostles (as we have already said) carefully abstained from promulgating the contradictory doctrine. At the same time it is perfectly consistent with this statement to admit, that those whose faith was more vigorous—who with more simple docility applied themselves to catch the full spirit of what the Apostles practically taught—would be pretty sure before long to discover that no such obligation existed. We do not, however, by any means apply this remark in its full extent to the Hebrew Christians of Palestine, isolated as they were and breathing an exclusively Jewish atmosphere: but

far more emphatically to the Jewish members of Gentile Churches; of Rome, Corinth, or Philippi. Accordingly S. Paul does not hesitate to call a Christian "weak in the faith," who has still scruples on the Jewish law of meats; though he strictly forbids others to speak of such a man with censure or disrespect.*

The most extreme error on the Judaizing side was that which first disturbed the Antiochene Church (Acts xv. 1); viz., that the observance of the Ceremonial Law is required of all Christians, Jewish or Heathen, as requisite for salvation. Dr. Döllinger points out very justly (p. 85) that "this was going beyond even the prevalent Jewish view of the period." Yet it arose naturally enough: for these men persuaded themselves that this Law is an integral part of the Church's Gospel; and all, of course, admitted that Church-membership was requisite for salvation. This extreme error, after the Council of Jerusalem, became an expressly condemned heresy. But there seems no doubt that previously it was not actually heretical; for the "much inquiry" mentioned in Acts xv. 7 shows that no direct and general promulgation had hitherto taken place of the contradictory doctrine. At that earlier period, therefore, such "false brethren" (Gal. ii. 4) were to be ranked with the class which is next to be considered.

There were many Jewish converts, then, at the time—corresponding to what would now be called "bad Catholics"—who held very serious errors, though short of that actually condemned. These men were filled with a fanatical and passionate love for the Mosaic ritual; and animated by that frightful pride, both national and personal, which was so characteristic of the Pharisaic Jew. They could not endure to entertain the thought, that the superiority of Jew over Gentile had come to an end; and they clung, therefore, to a fond belief, that those Gentiles who did not choose to acknowledge Jewish supremacy by keeping the Ceremonial Law, formed a separate and inferior nationality (so to speak) within the Church. In accordance with this, they held that Jewish observances, though not actually commanded by God to all, were nevertheless most efficacious methods for conciliating His especial favour. Now, as will presently be shown, nothing could be more opposed than all this to S. Peter's and S. James's teaching; still, it does not directly contradict their formal pronouncement. If S. Paul's language was too explicit and emphatic to admit of being misunderstood, these men took refuge in the persuasion that he was not an Apostle in

* Rom. xiv. 1, 3. See Dr. Murray "de Ecclesia," d. 6, n. 362-8.

the same full sense with the three "pillars:" drawing this monstrous inference, from the Church's universally received doctrine that S. Peter's ecclesiastical position was higher even than his. If it was clear—as undoubtedly it was most clear—that the earlier Apostles expressed towards him the fullest agreement and sympathy, this was explained by the supposition that he carefully concealed from those Apostles his real teaching. Many plausible reasons might be imagined, if it were worth while to pursue the subject, why it would not have been expedient to condemn these men by a second public Apostolic pronouncement; nor is there any trace whatever of S. Paul desiring such a pronouncement. They therefore avoided actual heresy; and possibly enough, many of them may have even been exempted from mortal sin against faith, by that invincible ignorance which resulted from their Jewish prejudice. However this may be, they certainly inflicted on the great Apostle the keenest pangs of grief, anxiety, perplexity; while, on the other hand, they afforded him an opportunity of exhibiting to future ages in the most touching light those most noble qualities, which graced his singularly affecting and attractive character.*

We are now to consider the facts recorded in Acts xv. Nor is it too much to say that these facts, on their very surface, and before entering into any detail whatever, are absolutely conclusive on our side of the present controversy. According to the implication of Protestants, S. Paul had received from God a commission to teach and govern his own flock, independently and irrespectively of the earlier Apostles. On such a supposition, what would have been his course when these Jewish teachers arrived at Antioch? He would have simply appealed to his indefeasible commission from God; and he would have warned his disciples against the solicitation of Judaizers, just as he might have warned them against that of heathens or of profligates. Facts are critically and precisely the reverse. He at once sees that no time is to be lost in communicating with his co-Apostles, and in promulgating an united decree on the vital issue which has arisen. In one word, he took that course which, if Catholic doctrine be true, was alone reasonable; but which, on the Protestant hypothesis, was a treacherous surrender of the trust reposed in him by God.

Before entering in detail on the facts, we must inquire

* We know of no other writer who treats S. Paul with that keen insight and sympathetic appreciation, which distinguish F. Newman's various disquisitions on his character. See *e.g.* "Occasional Sermons."

whether Acts xv. and Gal. ii. refer to the same visit. The question, indeed, is absolutely immaterial to our argument; but we must of necessity adopt one or other alternative, in order to exhibit the facts at all. We shall assume, then, the identity of these two visits; of which, indeed, we have ourselves no doubt whatever.* We will first state the facts, as they result from a combination of the two narratives; and we will not fail afterwards to consider carefully (what Protestants most strangely think their strong point) S. Paul's own account of, and reflection on, those facts.

Hardly, then, had SS. Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch, when certain Christians arrived from Judæa declaring, without the slightest warrant (Acts xv. 24), that the older Apostles enjoined circumcision on all converts as necessary to salvation. S. Paul, having learned the Gospel not from these older Apostles but from God Himself, and being well aware that they had enjoyed the self-same privilege, knew with absolute certainty that this allegation was false. He perceived at once, however, that he must, without any delay, confer with his co-Apostles; since, if an impression once prevailed of discrepancy between his doctrine and theirs, his labours, both past and prospective, might be rendered fruitless (Ne fortè, &c., Gal. ii. 2). The other authorities at Antioch were similarly impressed (Acts xv. 2); nay, Christ Himself by a special revelation commanded the same course (Gal. ii. 2). He and S. Barnabas, therefore, at once proceeded to Jerusalem, taking with them in their train S. Titus (Gal. ii. 3) and various others (Acts xv. 2). They passed through Phœnicæ and Samaria, proclaiming as they went the Gospel's glorious spread, and gladdening all pious hearts with the intelligence (Acts xv. 3). On arriving at Jerusalem, they were eagerly received by the three Apostles and by the elders, and poured forth into their ears the momentous intelligence which they had to communicate.

Those Judaizers who had been in Antioch arrived at Jerusalem about the same time; and, in company with others of the same class, clamoured that the new converts should be compelled to submit to circumcision and the Ceremonial Law (Acts xv. 5). The great body of believers would see at once the vital importance of this issue, and would eagerly cross-question the new comers; they would also debate the matter among themselves with the keenest interest, with much perplexity,

* Dr. Lightfoot states the reasons for this conclusion very clearly and convincingly (pp. 109-114); and we believe it has been far the most common, both in ancient and modern times. Dr. Dollinger also adopts it (p. 86).

and possibly with some heat. Meanwhile S. Paul, with whom the Three had hitherto possessed very little personal acquaintance, conferred with them privately (Gal. ii. 2). They discovered, on examination, as S. Paul well knew would be the case, that his knowledge of the Gospel was fully equal to their own; that nothing remained which they could add to it (Gal. ii. 6).^{*} So far, indeed, from it,—they saw plainly from his communications that God had specially charged him with the work of preaching to the Gentiles; just as He had specially charged S. Peter with that of preaching to the Jews (Gal. ii. 7). Thereupon they gave in their full submission to this Divine appointment; and decided that he and S. Barnabas should continue labouring among the former, while they gave themselves to the latter.[†] “At the same time whatever communities SS. Paul and Barnabas might find, were to be connected with the Church at Jerusalem; and testify their relation to it as daughters, by sending contributions for the poor there.” (Döllinger, p. 88) And to this, as we see in many parts of his epistles, S. Paul did, in fact, bestow constant attention.

Before we proceed to the subsequent history, we will point out in the above certain faint intimations of S. Peter's Primacy. Thus (1) S. Paul was specially appointed by Christ as Doctor of the Gentiles; and yet it was S. Peter, and *not* S. Paul, who had employed “the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven” to open the door for their admission. Then (2) S. Paul himself always ascribes to the Jews a certain superiority over the Gentiles; and invariably (as has been already mentioned) preached first to them in every place. It would appear, then, that “the Apostle of the Circumcision” has a certain precedence over “the Apostle of the Uncircumcision.” (3) It is by the older Apostles, and not by S. Paul, that the ecclesiastical arrangement was proposed, which assigned to each Apostle his respective sphere. On the other hand (4) S. Peter's precedence over SS. John and James is involved in the fact that to him, and not to them, is committed the Apostolate of the Circumcision; and this, though S. James was actually Bishop of Jerusalem. Lastly

^{*} This is unquestionably the meaning of “*προσάριθεντο*,” as will be presently shown.

[†] “This did not hinder Paul from labouring with unwearied zeal to win his countrymen to faith in Christ, or withdraw Peter and John from preaching to the Gentiles when opportunity offered. All communities already founded, or now growing up beyond the limits of Judæa, were composed of both Jews and Gentiles, so that every Apostle who did not remain in Judæa, like James, must attend to both.”—*Döllinger*, p. 88.

(5) Whereas S. Paul expressly calls S. Peter "the Apostle of the Circumcision;" elsewhere (Rom. xv. 8) he calls our Lord by the appellation, so strikingly similar, "the Minister of the Circumcision." And it is obvious to remark, that, just as Jesus Christ was not the less Lord and Redeemer of the whole Church, though specially Minister of the Circumcision,—so S. Peter also need be none the less Ruler over the whole Church, though in a special sense Apostle of the Circumcision.

To proceed. Very soon afterwards a larger Congress assembled (Acts xv. 6), consisting of the five Apostles and the Jerusalem elders. On this occasion, doubtless, the Apostles delivered their concurrent testimony on the Christian dogma; all the various facts and bearings of the question were carefully investigated; and a practical conclusion arrived at. It was resolved that a public assembly of Christians should be summoned.* At this assembly two pronouncements were to be publicly made; a doctrinal decision, and a disciplinary enactment: though the latter was to include, indeed, the emphatic enforcement of an admitted and most prominent principle in Christian morality. The doctrinal decision was to be suitably pronounced by S. Peter,† and with this the public proceedings were to commence. The multitude of believers, then, having come together—and the lively interchange of opinion having continued to the last moment—S. Peter at length rose up among them (Acts xv. 7). The terms of the doctrinal judgment which he delivered are very remarkable; and had S. Paul delivered it instead of S. Peter, Protestants would, doubtless, have dwelt on them as proving his superior enlightenment. He reminds his hearers of what they well knew—the circumstances of Cornelius's conversion; and he speaks with some severity of those who had failed to see, that by those circumstances God had really decided the question. "Why do ye tempt God," he says, by persistent Judaizing? We would ask, moreover, when did *S. Paul* ever use language, concerning the Ceremonial Law in itself,

* S. Luke's narrative by itself includes two different meetings. For (1) "the Apostles and elders met together to see about this matter" (v. 6); and (2) after S. Peter's speech "*the whole multitude was silent*" (v. 12). And the final assent was given (v. 22) by "the Apostles, and elders, and *whole Church*."

† Protestants are fond of alleging that S. James occupied a more authoritative place in this Council than S. Peter. Nothing but the blindness of prejudice can account for so strange a misapprehension; and we are glad to find Dean Alford frankly admitting (ad v. 7) that S. Peter took the more prominent part on this occasion. He attributes this (1) to "the *universal deference* paid to him," and (2) to his past history in the matter of Cornelius.

so harsh as S. Peter's declaration (v. 10) that it was a yoke "which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear"? Then further, though he does not expressly condemn those lesser Judaizing errors which we recounted above, yet such language as we have cited tends, in drift and spirit, most urgently against them. Lastly, he uses S. Paul's favourite words of "grace" and "faith" just as S. Paul might have used them (vv. 9, 11). "You were justified by faith," says S. Paul; "the Gentiles' hearts have been purified by faith," says S. Peter. "How Pauline is S. Peter's speech!" will be the exclamation of many a Protestant: "how Petrine is S. Paul's doctrine!" will be the Catholic's far more reasonable comment. Dr. Lightfoot most gratuitously refers the "Pauline" tone of S. Peter's first Epistle—which certainly cannot be denied—to S. Paul's personal influence over his mind (p. 330). But at this early period no one can allege the existence of any such influence; and yet S. Peter's language is the very same. Since Dr. Lightfoot admits the Apostles to have been inspired, what is that strange difficulty which prevents him from imagining it possible, that "One and the same Spirit" may have deeply imbued different minds with one and the same doctrine?*

It is next relevant to point out how subordinate a place in the public proceedings was held, whether by S. Paul or S. James, as compared with S. Peter. When the latter had finished speaking, the voice of controversy was no longer heard (v. 12); and the whole multitude gave attentive ear to SS. Paul and Barnabas, while they recounted those astounding marvels which God had wrought through their instrumentality. S. James's address, which followed, consisted of two different points. Firstly, he conciliated the Hebrews, who were his especial flock, by pointing out how clearly the heathens' vocation had been prophesied in the Old Testament itself. Secondly, he announced those regulations which it had been resolved to impose on the Gentile converts. "In order to facilitate a real fusion of Jews and Gentiles in the Church, the latter were to abstain from certain things peculiarly repulsive to the Jews; viz., from sharing in heathen sacrificial feasts, and eating blood or the flesh of strangled animals. The Apostles felt the more bound to require the observance of these restrictions, as it was a matter causing offence to the Jews and making Christianity appear to them a religion beset with heathen abominations. It was thought necessary in

* We much regret to find in Dr. Döllinger similar language: vol. i. p. 134.

Jerusalem to add the prohibition of "fornication," because impurity and sins of the flesh were so common and so little regarded among the heathen, that much of this sort might also survive among converts from heathenism."* (Döllinger, p. 87.) The purely disciplinary portion of this enactment was not intended to be permanent; we may even see pretty clearly that it was not intended, even at the time, to be universal. (See Estius ad 1 Cor. x. 30. See also Dr. Lightfoot's excellent remarks in pp. 289, 290.) But as the matter is wholly irrelevant to our argument, we pass it over.

The Apostles and elders of Jerusalem proceeded at once to draw up an Encyclical Letter, in accordance with the Apostolic Decrees (Acts xv. 23—29); and two portions of this demand our attention. Firstly, the hearty warmth of brotherly love with which they refer to SS. Paul and Barnabas (vv. 25, 26); and secondly, the matter-of-course way in which they assume, as divinely given them, a spiritual jurisdiction over S. Paul's converts. "*Visum est Spiritui Sancto et nobis nihil ultra imponere vobis oneris quàm hæc necessaria*" (v. 28). And so far were SS. Paul and Barnabas from protesting against this in any kind of way, that, on the contrary (vv. 31—33) they and the whole Antiochene Church greeted the letter with extreme delight; and they received, moreover, its bearers with so hearty a welcome, that one of them, Silas, fixed his abode at Antioch.

We are next to consider certain expressions in S. Paul's own account of what took place at Jerusalem, which Protestants have most strangely understood as implying some disparagement of his co-Apostles. Certainly, before we look into details at all, it is evident that these critics have embarked in a very hopeless undertaking; because S. Paul begins by expressly saying that he communicated with the Three, "*ne fortè in vacuum currerem aut cucurrissem*" (Gal. ii. 2). It is absolutely impossible to understand S. Paul otherwise in these words, than as recognizing some singular authority vested in the Three or in one of their number. Dr. Lightfoot suggests (ad locum) that "these words must be taken to express his fear lest the Judaic Christians, by insisting on the Mosaic ritual, might thwart his past and present endeavours to establish a Church on a liberal basis." But on the Protestant view how could such a danger possibly exist? Nothing certainly would *in itself* be more repulsive to the Gentile converts, than the Jewish ceremonial law; and S. Paul himself was most clear and express in his warnings against their observing it. Dr.

* Acts xv. Gal. ii. 1—10.

Lightfoot's suggestion, then, necessarily involves, what all Catholics believe to have been the case; viz., that S. Paul had imbued his converts with the deepest reverence for S. Peter's office. If such were indeed the fact, there was of course great danger lest the Judaizers—claiming as they did falsely S. Peter's authority (Acts xv. 24)—might succeed in perverting true doctrine among the Antiochenes. For ourselves, however, we are inclined to understand v. 2 in a somewhat different sense; and would paraphrase it thus: "Lest if a suspicion once gained ground that my doctrine differed from that of my co-Apostles, my past and future labours might become fruitless." But whichever way you take the verse, it necessarily implies (as we have said) some very singular authority possessed by the Three or by one of their number. And is it *probable*, we ask,—this being so,—that S. Paul, in writing to the Galatian Church, should have proceeded to *increase* the existing suspicion of a divergence between his doctrine and theirs, by referring to them in language of disparagement? The supposition is not less than monstrous. Moreover, we may remind our readers, that in the first chapter he had already spoken most respectfully of S. Peter; and had explained that his chief reason for going at once to Jerusalem, when driven from Damascus, was in order that he might make acquaintance with that Apostle. Now, then, for the particular phrases on which Protestants insist.

Several of them lay stress on "*τοῖς δοκοῦσιν*" in verse 2; "*τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι*" in verse 6; as though this phrase signified "those who seem to be, and claim to be, more than they are." But that this phrase implies no disparagement, is manifest; were it only for this circumstance, that it is substantially repeated in verse 9, where his direct purpose is to *magnify* the importance of "James and Cephas and John." And Catholic writers have shown that there are various passages of Scripture, where the Greek word, so translated, is used in a sense most suitable to the present context. The phrase, "those who seem to be something," undoubtedly means "those who are justly in repute;" "those who are, on good grounds, highly thought of:" not "those who seem what they are not," but "who seem what they are." So Luke xxii. 24, which is translated in the Protestant version, "There arose a strife among them which should be greatest," runs in the original, "which of them *seems* to be greatest." Again, Mark x. 42:—"Those who *are accounted* to rule over them" is really "those who *seem* to rule over them"; that is, "those who bear *visible* rule." And so Dr. Lightfoot translates the phrase (ad v. 2): "men of repute and honour." He adds that "the expression conveys no shadow of depreciation."

Next, v. 6. "Ab iis autem qui videbantur esse aliquid (quales aliquando fuerint nihil meâ interest: Deus personam hominis non accipit), mihi autem qui videbantur esse aliquid nihil contulerunt." Protestants commonly drop the word "aliquando" of the Vulgate rendering, and understand the verse in some such sense as the following: "I care not what they or any other men think. God regards not the person of men. These personages, with all their high claims, could give me no light on Gospel Truth. I have my own commission independent of them." As a mere matter of scholarship, never was there an interpretation more unfounded. The question turns entirely on the verb "*προσανίθηντο*." Hear Dr. Lightfoot on this word. "*Προσανιθεσθαι* is 'to communicate, to impart,' whether for the purpose of giving or of obtaining instruction. In this passage the former meaning prevails, in i. 16 the latter. The context here decides its sense: 'they imparted no fresh knowledge to me; they saw nothing defective or incorrect in my teaching; but on the contrary, they heartily recognized my mission'" (p. 104). Such an expression, then, implies at once that he recognized in the Three, or in one of them, a full right to inquire into his doctrine; and that he reports with emphasis and with pleasure the favourable judgment passed on that doctrine. This sense of the word "contulerunt" being granted, it is absolutely impossible to give the verse a Protestant sense: yet it may be well to consider what is in fact its precise meaning. For instance, what is to be understood by "*ὅποιοί ποτε ἦσαν*, &c."? Most Protestant commentators have hitherto rejected the Vulgate word "aliquando," and have taken "*ὅποιοί ποτε*" to mean "qualescunque": but Dr. Lightfoot (ad loc.) points out that "*ποτε* never occurs with the meaning 'cunque' in the New Testament." It is obvious to suppose that his Judaizing enemies had represented him to the Galatians as despising the older Apostles, for being rude and unlearned Jews; for being unable to take enlarged and spiritual views of the Gospel. "It is nothing to me," he here says, "what was their origin or what their education. God is in no way dependent on such things; and may raise rude and illiterate fishermen, as easily as he can raise a Jewish doctor, into the position of an Apostle." This is in substance the second exposition given by Estius ad locum.

There are no other particular phrases cited by Protestants for their purpose; but they appeal further, and with great confidence, to the general rhetoric and bearing of the two chapters. We are most fully persuaded, on the contrary, that this general drift and bearing favours emphatically, not the

Protestant, but the Catholic interpretation. But before embarking on this general subject, it is necessary to notice another event, recorded in the same chapter, which occurred very soon after the Council of Jerusalem.

At that period S. Peter went to reside at Antioch; and, indeed, as Tradition informs us, he established there for a time the Primatial See. It is in itself worthy of remark, that he thus established himself in the very metropolis (as one may say) of Gentile Christianity; and in that place which, of all others, would bring him into closest contact with S. Paul. Further, on his arrival, "he had no scruple about living as a Gentile; *i. e.*, associating at table and in domestic life with Gentiles;" and by so doing he became "in the eyes of all Jews a complete breaker of the law" (Döllinger, p. 89; Gal. ii. 12). This is the first instance recorded in Scripture, where any Apostle thus acted; and the narrative further implies that SS. Paul and Barnabas pursued a similar habit. It is no improbable conjecture that this had been determined at Jerusalem, by the Apostles in consultation with the elders, as the appropriate course for an Apostle to pursue while sojourning in Gentile Churches. After some time, however, a number of the Hebrew Christians arrived at Antioch; and their arrival placed S. Peter in a great difficulty. "Fearing those who were of the Circumcision" (ver. 12), does not of course mean that he feared anything they could do against him—that he feared their ill opinion or the like—rather he feared *for* them. Thus (iv. 11) S. Paul says, "*I fear you, lest I should have laboured in vain among you.*" And so S. Peter *feared* these Jews, lest if the full truth were prematurely forced upon their notice—the truth that in fact there was no obligation on *any one* to keep the Mosaic ritual—they might seek relief from their perplexity in actual apostasy. He judged it better, accordingly, during their sojourn, to fall back on the old recognized Apostolic practice of observing the Law. The fact that S. Paul's remonstrance against this has been woven into the texture of an inspired Epistle, gives ground for absolute certainty that S. Peter here made a mistake of judgment. Yet nothing could be more natural than that he should so act; and further, that the other Christians of the Circumcision, including S. Barnabas, should be led by him into practising the same course. It was but doing as they had always hitherto done.

Yet it was only to be expected that S. Paul should see the whole matter in a most opposite light. Just as S. Peter by his history was led specially to realize the possible perplexity of the *Jewish* Christians, so S. Paul was no less led thereby

to consider the very serious evil probably accruing in regard to the *Gentiles*. His argument, as we imagine, was of the following kind:—"Things cannot again be as they formerly were. To take a step backward, can never possibly be the same thing with not having taken a step forward. So long as the Apostles in any place observed the consistent practice of Jewish ceremonies, the case was different. But to continue for a considerable period eating with the Gentiles, and then cease to do so, is in fact to put an actual pressure on the Gentiles in a wrong direction. Such a procedure must act on them, as a direct inducement to give up their Christian liberty, and to take on themselves that yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear." That the word "compel," in ver. 14, means no more than this *moral* pressure, or strong inducement, is admitted by Protestant commentators no less than by Catholic; and is indeed perfectly certain from the whole context. And S. Paul sees that his co-Apostles, by their procedure, "*οὐκ ὀρθοδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου*" (v. 14): *i.e.* "are far from taking those steps which are directly conducive to the advancement of Gospel Truth."

We are now, therefore, to consider how these facts bear on the two main points of our inquiry. Firstly, do they show that S. Peter was less thoroughly acquainted with Gospel Truth than S. Paul? No one can possibly think so: the very protest made by the latter regarded S. Peter's "dissimulation;" *i.e.*, his not publicly professing what he interiorly held. Such "dissimulation" had been hitherto the universal habit of the Apostles: nay, it was practised by S. Paul himself again and again; after this period no less than before it. He practised it when he circumcised Timothy, "because of the Jews, who were in those parts (Acts xvi. 3); when he shaved his head in Cenchrea (Acts xviii. 18); when he purified himself in the Temple at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 26). But he considered the present a very ill-chosen occasion for such "dissimulation." There was no difference then whatever, nor any tendency to difference, between S. Peter and himself, on any doctrinal point: their difference turned exclusively on a matter of spiritual prudence. Secondly, then, we are to ask whether S. Paul implied any denial of S. Peter's Primacy. And to ask such a question is to answer it. No Catholic in the world ever dreamed of maintaining, that the Supreme Pontiff is exempt from all liability to pursue an unwise and imprudent course; nay, or that earnest remonstrance may not be lawfully and meritoriously addressed to him by any grave and confidential adviser, who considers that he is entering on such a course.

Suppose, indeed, the impossible case, that S. Peter had commanded S. Paul to separate from the Gentiles, and that S. Paul had disobeyed,—Catholic theology, no doubt, would be shaken to its foundations; but there is not the most distant suggestion of the kind. And Protestants strangely misapprehend a Catholic's view of the relation between the two Apostles, if they imagine that he would see anything in S. Paul's demeanour which was not most edifying and Christian.

If Protestants most gratuitously assume that S. Peter, after S. Paul's remonstrance, pursued an unchanged course, Catholics have just as much right to assume the reverse. The latter conclusion is certainly much the more probable of the two. For, as will be immediately seen, S. Paul's main purpose in these two chapters is to vindicate himself against all suspicion of doctrinal divergence from the earlier Apostles; and it is most improbable therefore that he would have referred the Galatians to any incident, which implied a permanent divergence of practical conduct and spiritual policy between S. Peter and himself. For ourselves—as a matter of personal impression—we cannot doubt that S. Peter promptly recognized and repaired his mistake; and most certainly nothing whatever can be found, either in Scripture or Tradition, which tends to negative such an impression.

This whole history, then, as we have seen, involves no disparagement of S. Peter's Primacy. But, in fact, there are one or two particulars in it which somewhat corroborate that doctrine. For instance, "I withstood him to the face" (v. 11). The very form of expression implies a certain boldness of act. To differ ever so strongly from one whom he regarded as in all respects his equal, would hardly have been expressed by so strong and forcible a phrase. Then again, even S. Barnabas—between whom and S. Paul no shadow of difference had yet arisen,—who had just received *with* S. Paul a commission to the Gentiles,—even S. Barnabas followed S. Peter rather than S. Paul. For what imaginable reason, except the former's superior authority? And how very strong a word is "*ἀναγκάσεις*" in v. 14! How very great an influence does it ascribe to S. Peter over S. Paul's own Gentile converts!

But, as we just now observed, there is an argument derived from the general rhetoric and bearing of the two chapters, which Protestants consider of irresistible force. "Surely it is most plain on the surface," they argue, "that S. Paul's very "object throughout is the claiming to himself an authority "supreme and absolute in its own order; an authority, derived "from God by direct commission, and independent, therefore,

"of the earlier Apostles. Even granting, for argument's sake, that S. Paul's resistance to S. Peter at Antioch may be sufficiently explained;—yet why should S. Paul recount all this so very emphatically, at a later period, to the Galatians? Or why does he dwell so earnestly (i. 16, 17) on the fact that, immediately after his conversion, his 'communication was not with flesh and blood;' and that for three years he had no intercourse with the earlier Apostles? Why does he regard this fact as so important (v. 20), that he even attests it with an oath? Why, lastly, does he assure us so earnestly and so pointedly (ii. 3—5) that he withheld all concession to the 'false brethren,' and refused to allow S. Titus's circumcision? What motive can possibly be assigned for all this, unless a motive which is fatal to Catholic doctrine; viz., the vindicating as his just due a personal and independent authority?"

We reply most confidently, in the very teeth of the objection, (1) that the general rhetoric and bearing of the two chapters are most easily intelligible on a Catholic hypothesis; but that (2) they are utterly irreconcilable with any Protestant view. All that is necessary for their full and clear understanding, is to make one hypothesis: and this, moreover, an hypothesis, which every one must acknowledge to be in itself most simple and probable, nay obviously suggested by the facts of the case.

It is perfectly certain, and admitted by Catholics and Protestants alike, that S. Paul's steps were dogged at every turn by active and vehement opposers of his teaching. It is equally certain that these Judaizing opposers claimed the authority of S. Peter and the earlier Apostles as on their side, and charged S. Paul with the introduction of mischievous and dangerous novelties. The hypothesis which we make grows at once out of this admitted fact. That in a certain sense S. Paul possessed the sanction of S. Peter and the rest, was surely too manifest and notorious to admit of dispute. We suppose, therefore, that these Judaizers, when pressed, confessed so much, but gave their own account of the fact. They maintained that S. Paul was double-faced; and that he preached a most different doctrine when in communication with the earlier Apostles, from that which he inculcated on his Gentile converts. And there were circumstances in S. Paul's life, undoubtedly, on which such an accusation might be plausibly founded. Such was his circumcising S. Timothy (Acts xvi. 3), "because of the Jews who were in those parts." Such also was the fact recorded in Acts xxi. 26. In both these cases, as in many others, S. Paul, being a Jew, practised the Jewish Law, expressly for the purpose of avoiding all offence to the

Jews. To this general habit he himself alludes (1 Cor. ix. 19—21, also x. 32, 33). We are not here explaining how S. Paul's conduct in all this was most perfectly reasonable and consistent; though this might most easily be done. We are but citing it in corroboration of our hypothesis. And let this hypothesis be once conceded, the two chapters thence acquire a most natural and intelligible drift. We may paraphrase them as follows:—

“These, my opponents, declare to you that they have learned their views of Christianity from S. Peter and the elder Apostles. I totally deny it; and I have, in fact, far more means than they have for knowing the mind of those Apostles. Yet you must not understand the case to be, that you have only to balance *their* interpretation of Peter's meaning against *my* interpretation. My Gospel is indeed the very same as Peter's: but it was not from Peter that I learned it. It was not from flesh and blood that I received my instruction in Christian Truth. He who so mercifully Himself converted me, Himself also taught me. I call God to witness that it was three years after my conversion before I even saw Peter: even then I saw no other Apostle except James; and was for some time longer unknown by face to the Jewish Christians altogether. It was not from them that I ever professed to learn the Gospel.

“However, when I found reports to be so sedulously spread as to my differences from Peter, I was warned by God to go up to Jerusalem, in order to confer with him and with the other chief pillars of the Church. I fully knew, indeed, that the most perfect harmony of doctrine would be discovered between us; and so the event showed. They had nothing to add to the Gospel which I preached; and I received from them a distinct commission to occupy, as my peculiar province, the preaching to the Gentiles. It is with their express and direct sanction that I have preached to you the Gospel. It has been said against me that, in my communications with them I habitually conceal the most characteristic parts of my teaching. The most obvious facts are sufficient to refute this. At my first visit to Jerusalem, I had seen no Apostle except Peter and James, and remained there only fifteen days: so that there was but little opportunity for such hypocrisy. But in this other visit, which took place fourteen years after, a circumstance took place which shows how very openly I spoke. For I peremptorily refused, though strongly urged, to allow Titus's circumcision. I refused this, in order that I might avoid even the external semblance of concession to those who would

destroy Gospel liberty. Nay, shortly afterwards I went further still. I remonstrated publicly with the very Prince of the Apostles, when the necessity seemed to arise; when he showed himself wanting in clear perception as to that line of conduct which was called for, at a particular crisis, by the principles which we hold in common. If my teaching then possesses his full sanction, as my very opponents hardly deny, that sanction most certainly cannot have arisen from any concealment practised by me in his regard."

Interpreted then by Catholic doctrine, these chapters are most intelligible and most persuasive. But how can Protestants consistently explain them? They can understand, doubtless, in accordance with their own notions, the particular passage, Gal. ii. 11—14; but how can they even attempt to set forth the connection of the whole? How will they explain "*ἰστορήσαι Κήραν*"? or the stress which S. Paul lays (ii. 9) on the sanction he had received from the Three? above all, what imaginable rendering will they suggest for those very striking words (ii. 2) "*ne fortè in vacuum currerem aut cucurrissem*"? We only wish some Protestant would apply himself to doing what *we* have done; to drawing out a general paraphrase of the two chapters: in no other way would men so plainly see the hopeless failure of any attempt at a Protestant interpretation.

We have now gone through, we believe, all those portions of Scripture on which Protestants rely; and we have done enough, therefore, for strictly controversial purposes. Yet there are several other very interesting Scriptural questions, closely connected with the same subject, which it is not impossible that on some future occasion we may consider. We are referring, *e.g.*, to S. Paul's agreement with S. Peter in his profound reverence for the Old Testament, and in the precedence which he invariably ascribes to the Jews; to the deep identity in doctrine between S. Paul's inspired Epistles on the one hand, and those of the Three on the other hand;* to the many subtle indications throughout S. Paul's Epistles of his affectionate reverence for S. Peter. Indeed, we believe that the more accurate and critical study of Scripture, which is so characteristic of these times, has led thoughtful Protestant scholars to a far truer appreciation of the harmony between these two Apostles, than formerly prevailed among their co-religionists.

* Dr. Lightfoot (pp. 342, 343) gives really strong ground, we think, for considering that even S. James's language about "faith" and "works" was not directed against any perversion of S. Paul's teaching.

And Tradition declares on its surface what Scripture discloses to the careful inquirer. It universally represents SS. Peter and Paul, not as rivals, but, on the contrary, as bound together in strictest amity; as jointly enriching the Roman Church with their doctrine, and glorifying her by their martyrdom. "Glorious princes of the earth," sings the Church, "as they loved each other in their life, so also in their death they were not divided." Nor has she any more touching practice, than that of never celebrating the name of either, without also commemorating the other.

ART. III.—MEDIÆVAL MANICHÆISM AND THE INQUISITION.

Die Intoleranz der Katholischen Kirche, u.s.w., von G. M. Schuler. Augsburg: Kollmann. 1865.

BEFORE entering upon the main subject of this article, it may be well to premise a few words in general, about the civil punishment of religious offences. The chief outcry made against the Pontifical Encyclical of the 8th of December, 1864, still has for its pretext the condemnation of the doctrine of unrestricted freedom of worship, as put forth in some of the last condemned propositions in the Syllabus. Nevertheless, only three of the eighty errors which the faithful have been therein warned by the Holy Father to eschew, contest the duty of Governments to interfere with religious doctrine or practice; while, on the contrary, over forty advocate the right of the State either to violate the independence of the Catholic Church, oppress its clergy, control its teachings, remove the young from its instructions, or destroy the bond uniting its members to their Supreme Head on earth. The inconsistency of this two-sided hostility to Christianity makes manifest the insincerity, profanity, and wickedness of many of its adversaries; but their ravings ought not to be dignified by the name of intolerance, because they rest on no principle whatever. Toleration is not acquiescence in that which is just, even though irksome; but it is the endurance of what is not approved, and may be a very grievous sin. Divergence from the standard by which it may be believed that the relations of human beings to God ought to be regulated, must be repugnant to the heart, and the criminality of endeavouring to subvert it, or of setting up falsehood in the

place of truth, will appear enhanced, in proportion to the depth and earnestness of our piety. The only motives that can justify tacit approval, or toleration, of what is deemed essentially wrong, are fears lest evil should be fomented rather than diminished by interference, insufficient power, or doubts concerning the absolute and exclusive correctness of one's own objective, as well as subjective, judgment and knowledge.

The learned and pious Haneberg says that for the justification of the Jews, in what he calls the "Old Testament Inquisition,"* three absolute certainties were required; viz., the absolute certainty that their own religion was the only true one; the absolute certainty that the religion or practice of their enemies was an abomination to God; and the absolute certainty that the power and duty had been delegated to them by God, of representing Him on earth. If there could have existed, upon either of these points, the slightest possibility of a doubt, Jewish history would be a detail of the foulest atrocities ever witnessed under the sun. Persecution by any other than an infallible authority; infallibly certain of the precise correctness of its own standard; infallible in the knowledge of the odiousness to God of rebellion against it; and infallibly assured of its Divinely delegated right, would have been a crime against which every fibre of the heart revolts. The Jews' enemies, of course, denied their possession of any one of these certainties; but the Jews themselves knew, for all that, that they had them, and every one who believes the Old Testament to have been inspired by God, knows also that they had them. Divine inspiration teaches us that the Jews who perished in the long series of bloody strifes between them and the internal and external enemies of their Church, were martyrs of their faith, and that those whom they slew were victims of their own crimes.

The concrete right of punishing religious error is a corollary of spiritual infallibility, and is the application, by the State, of the natural law of self-preservation from evils which it has been taught by the Church to know *infallibly* are pernicious to the highest interests of society. Blackstone teaches† that the "civil liberty of a member of society is his natural liberty so far restrained by human laws as is necessary and expedient for the advantage of the public." Therefore, if the lawgiver possesses the *absolute certainty* that opposition to a Divine revelation or command affects society deleteriously, it is as

* Geschichte der Biblischen Offenbarung. Regensburg, 1852, S. 99.

† Blackstone's Commentaries, b. i. c. i. p. 125.

much his duty to prevent it as any other crime. Protestant States punish for disregarding the sanctity of Sunday; but it is a mere question of calculation whether this is a greater evil than circulating atheistic works, public teaching of false doctrine, promulgating a mutilated translation of the Bible, or ridiculing the character of glorified Saints. In fact, correct practice concerning these matters, if certainty of truth may be had concerning them, must be as beneficial to society as the observance of Sunday. The theoretic difference between Catholics and others is, that while the former derive their right of interference from the infallible certainty that what they suppress is a public evil, the latter assume to punish, without pretending to know positively that their penal laws are not unjust, which is tyranny. Practically, Catholics are conscientiously intolerant of what they *know*, as the Jews did, from God, to be blasphemous or erroneous; but Protestant and freethinking persecution is against their own fundamental principle of the inalienable right of private judgment in matters of belief, and in spite of the acknowledged danger of suppressing tenets they may afterwards see fit to adopt. Thus Cranmer burnt Lambert and Askew for the very opinions for which he himself afterwards suffered.

The promulgation of the faith of Jesus Christ commenced in suffering, and, therefore, under the humblest and most peaceful auspices; but its rigorously exclusive Catholicity, and stern anathematizing of traitors within and foes without, date from the very earliest teachings of its founders. The Apostles and first promulgators of Christianity preached through the world like humble, holy despots, never permitting a dissent or murmur against what they inculcated. They no more doubted the certainty of what they taught, that everything opposed to it was error, or their own Divine commission, than the existence of God Himself. They never quailed before the hostility of the rich, wise, and powerful of their day, but fearlessly asserted their claims, and made their sway felt, wherever God's glory required it. "It seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and to us," was their warrant, and those who did not accept it were to be regarded as "heathen and publicans." If an "angel from heaven" could have preached differently from what they did, they pronounced him "accursed"; and it would require many pages to enumerate their anathemas, as God's vicars, against "heretics," "introducers of damnable heresies," and all who dissented from their ordinances. The absolutism of the New Testament rulers was greater and more effectual than under the old law,

although exercised in a different manner. S. Peter pronounced sentence, by inspiration, against Ananias and Sapphira, for an offence of which only an ecclesiastical tribunal could take cognizance; and God immediately and miraculously confirmed his judgment by the death of the transgressors.

Nor was doctrinal and disciplinarian exclusivism confined to the Apostolic age. The Apostles enjoined upon their successors to transmit the powers bestowed upon them to "faithful men," who might exercise similar dominion after them in the Church; whilst the masses of the people were commanded implicitly to "obey their prelates, and be subject to them."* In a word, from the Apostolic epoch, through every succeeding age, there has continued to exist upon earth an institution to which familiar parlance has, at all times, accorded a monopoly of the title, the Catholic Church; which has been governed by rulers successively exercising an absolute, infallible spiritual sway; which has ever professed not only to believe (in the popular sense of that term) but to possess absolute certainty, that its teachings are infallibly true; that all contradictory teachings are infallibly false; and that uncompromising spiritual intolerance of, and spiritual warfare against, every element, within and without, in revolt against it, is its bounden duty to God.

During the centuries of persecution, before the Church ceased to be in antagonism with the temporal power, it presented the same stern front to the innumerable heresies which conflicted with it that the Apostles had done. A vigilant inquisition into the conduct of its members was kept up; punishments proportioned in severity to each offence, such as fasting, chastisement, imprisonment, or excommunication, were inflicted, and its claim to the exercise of such temporal power was undisputed by Christians and voluntarily submitted to.

After its Christianization, the Roman Empire could not but perceive the criminality of many offences, which had, hitherto, been judged by ecclesiastical tribunals only; nor, from a strictly ethical point of view, could the Church deny to the State the right of punishing them. But a difference, as great as that between divine and human laws, distinguished the principles by which Church and State were respectively governed in treating their common enemies. The spirit of the principle, "*cujus regio ejus religio*," is as old as the world; and the policy of governments, Pagan as well as Christian, of every race, clime, and creed, has ever been to

* Hebrews xiii. 17.

regard religious unity as the strongest cement of national concord. Singularity in religion, until within a hundred years, has been regarded as a treasonable offence, and, aside from any principle of piety or sacred duty, has been cruelly punished as a source of disorder and rebellion. While the chastisements of the Church were inflicted for mercy's sake, to save the offender, the State polity has tended to sacrifice the offender, in order to avenge its own majesty and propitiate justice. The Church regards the crime less than the malice and contumacy of the criminal; the State contemplates only the wrong to be expiated, making no allowance for motives, degrees of culpability, or even repentance. The most inexorable rigour on the part of the Church has an unselfish and merciful end; the severity of the State is usually found to be in an inverse ratio with its security and strength. The penal canon laws against heresy are milder than those in any other known code; whereas imperial edicts are frequently, in defiance of and opposition to the canon law, most stringently harsh and retaliatory. Though the Church has sanctioned as just, the principle that the State should punish heretical disorders, she has waged ceaseless war against its tyranny in applying it; and among the greatest of the evils with which she has had, from the time of Constantine, to contend, has been that the most zealous sticklers for *State* Catholicity, and the most vengeful extirpators of heresy, were those very monarchs who were most inimical to the influence of Church power among their own subjects.

These two elements must be carefully distinguished. The Catholic Church is directly responsible for an uncompromising zeal in preserving its doctrines inviolate against the heresies which have arisen against it; for the anathemas and spiritual punishments with which she has sought to eradicate them; and for sanctioning the aid she has received from Christian powers, within the limits of the canon law. But she is not responsible for the superadded element of pure State interest, which she has always repudiated, and from which every deservedly censurable harshness has been derived.

The spirit of the restrictive edicts of the first Christian emperors against heretics, was generally conformable to the laws of the Church. The decree of Theodosius, A.D. 382, which rendered the Manichæans and Donatists liable to fines, exile, and civil disabilities, fell far short of the severity which would be exercised against them at the present day. Martial law would be justly proclaimed by any now existing State against the movers of such tumults and seditions, and the perpetrators of enormities, such as they were guilty of. Valentinian and

Marcian distinguished between contumacious public teachers of heresy and their disciples, ordering that the former should be punished by death, and the latter by banishment, disgrace, and fines.* Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, subjected to the existing enactments against heresy all who, even slightly, dissented from Catholic doctrine.† Justinian made a just and marked distinction between Manichæans and other sectarians. Whilst the latter were treated with comparative mildness, the former incurred the heaviest penalties of the law.‡ The influence of the Church modified, however, the severity with which these decrees were executed, and the capital penalty was rarely inflicted.

The first victims, after Constantine's time, of a penal retribution more cruel than banishment, were Catholics themselves, under the Arian rule of Constantine and Valens—the first of whom introduced incarceration, and the latter wholesale drowning, for non-conformity to Arian tenets.§ Sanguinary measures were first resorted to, on the Catholic side, by the Emperor Maximus, who, at the instigation of Ithacius, Bishop of Ossonoba, in 385, at Treves, sentenced Priscillian, his wife, and five others, leaders of the sect called the Priscillianists, to be beheaded. Priscillian was a bad man, and the mysteries of his sect abominable and obscene; but the violence employed against him was condemned by S. Ambrose and S. Martin of Tours, the holiest men of their time, and Pope Siricius censured the Emperor, and deposed the Bishop from his episcopate, for their short-sighted and cruel zeal.||

The history of the ancient Church is a continued detail of conflicts with her enemies, and a great portion of the writings of the early fathers are but refutations of prevailing errors; still, excepting where deviation from faith was associated with outward excesses, as in the cases of the Donatists, Circumcellions, and others, where S. Augustine and S. Leo invoked imperial aid, the Church generally looked with a jealous eye upon the intervention of the secular arm. Beyond the point to which she recognized the obligation of the State to go in protecting faith and excluding heresy, she interfered, even to protect her enemies; interposing, as S. Gregory VII. did in

* Cod. l. i. tit. v. 8, de Hæreticis.

† Ib. v. 2, de Hær.

‡ Ib. 11, 12. Cod. Just. l. i. tit. v. n. 19.

§ *Socrates*, Hist. Eccl., lib. iv. c. 16. *Sozomenus*, Hist. Eccl., lib. vi. c. 14. *Theodoret*, Hist. Eccl., lib. iv. c. 24. Vid. Hefele, Cardinal Ximenes, Tübingen, 1851, S. 342.

|| *Döllinger*, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, I. Band, S. 95.

granting an asylum to the unfortunate Berengarius,* the mercy of God against the justice of man.

Manichæism was the only heresy—if it ought not rather to be called a hideous pagan caricature of Christianity—which both Church and State deemed undeserving of any indulgence whatsoever. We cannot here enter into a detail of the tenets of the Manichæans, but they constituted a species of Zoroaster-Buddhism, fire-worship united to Vedaism, on which the founder had later, from policy, monstrosly engrafted a portion of the external form, without one single principle of Christianity.† The frightful corruption which was the necessary consequence of the teachings of this sect, was the very putrescence of immorality, which no government, scarcely anarchy itself, would have tolerated. The gross crimes which judicial investigation disclosed among their so called *electi* justified any means necessary for their suppression.‡

In the early part of the fourth century, within fifty years of the flaying alive of its founder in Persia, this sect had made such rapid strides in the West that it had already numberless adherents in every province of the Roman empire. A part of the odium in which Christians were held by enlightened Pagans, arose from their being confounded with the Manichæans, and the similarly guilty Gnostic sects who preceded them.

Under the Pagan Emperor Diocletian, Manichæan heretics were burnt alive, and every Christian Emperor of note issued edicts against them, the increased severity of which, as late as Justinian, shows how numerous they must have still secretly been in his time. In fact, an unbroken succession of Gnostic-Manichæan doctrines and sects may be traced, through the whole course of ecclesiastical history, down to the latest period of the Middle Ages. Internal dissensions revealed their existence, under the name of Paulicians, in 690, to Justinian II., who condemned to death, by fire, those who should persist in their irregularities.§ These Paulicians, whom a recent Protestant commentator on the Apocalypse allows himself to call a sect of true Christians, “which,” he says, “bore full and honourable testimony to the truth as it is in Jesus,”|| emulated the crimes of their predecessors. We learn from both Greek and Armenian historians, whose nar-

* *Sporschil's Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche*, II. Band, S. 34.

† *Döllinger's Lehrbuch*, I. Band, S. 34.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 34.—S. Augustin. *Index Hæreseon*, p. 46.

§ *Döllinger's Lehrbuch*, I. Band, S. 344 u. fg.

|| Notes on the Book of Revelations, by Albert Barnes, p. 318.

ratives are wholly independent of each other, that the vilest abominations were practised in their nocturnal assemblies; that they rejected the Old and a large portion of the New Testament, worshipped the sun, and that their teachings concerning our Saviour were a mass of odious blasphemies. Like all Manichæan sects, both before and after them, they looked upon lying to avoid punishment, or to promulgate their creed, as permitted.*

In the year 770, Baanes, their chief, acquired the name of "The Filthy," on account of his shameless vices; and Paulicianism had fallen into such deep and public degradation of morals that it appeared on the point of self-destruction. Tychicus, the successor of Baanes, caused himself to be worshipped as the Paraclete. He was slain in 835, and the Paulicians had then become so obnoxious and dangerous to the government, that the Grecian Empress Theodora resolved to convert or to destroy them. During her reign a hundred thousand of these heretics must have been hanged, beheaded, or drowned. Carbeas, however, one of their leaders, with five thousand followers, found refuge in the dominions of the Caliphs, and being continually reinforced by malefactors, who fled to them for asylum, they became the curse and scourge of the Asiatic provinces. Professor Döllinger† quotes the following advice of a Caliph to his son, from the Camel of Ibn-Athir:—"Then Caliph Mahdi spake to his son Hadi: 'When thou art at the head of the kingdom, bestow every care to extirpate the sects of the followers of Manes. They begin by preaching laudable actions, such as to avoid vice, forsake the world, and prepare for a future life. Soon they teach,

* Hallam admits that they "revived the Manichæan theory;" "ascribed the creation of the world to an evil deity;" concerning the incarnation of Christ were Docetists, and "denied the reality of His death and resurrection."—(*Middle Ages*, c. ix. p. 503.) Gibbon, who praises them, says they were dualistic; "abhorred the Old Testament as the fabulous and absurd invention of men and demons;" detested S. Peter, and rejected his Epistles, on account of the strife between S. Paul and that Apostle; subverted Christian doctrine concerning Jesus Christ, and practised dissimulation to hide their tenets.—(*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, c. liv.) Mosheim admits that they were a Gnostic sect, "allied to the Manichæans" (*Murdock's Mosheim*, Pt. II. c. v. p. 266); and so does Landulphus Saga, who says (*Hist. Misc.*, l. xxiv.), Manichæi qui nunc Pauliciani dicuntur. See also Hurter, *Geschichte Pabst Innocenz des Dritten*, S. 209. The learned Döllinger, whose sources of information are Photius adv. Paulianistas, Petrus Siculus, Johannes Ozniensis, etc., gives details of the Paulicians which prove their identity with the Manichæans, and that they were guilty of the crimes of that sect (*Lehrbuch*, I. Bd. 343-346).

† Muhammed's Religion, von Döllinger, S. 115, n. ff.

further, to abstain from meat, from touching clean water, and from killing insects. Then they inculcate the adoration of the two principles of darkness and of light. Finally, they allow their disciples to marry their sisters and daughters, dictate filthy ablutions, and teach them to kidnap children in order to withdraw them from darkness and put them under the influence of light.'” In 969, the Emperor John Zimisces finally succeeded in transplanting the descendants of these fugitives into the country of Philippopolis, in Thrace, from whence they soon began to propagate their infamous errors, and make a formidable appearance in Western Europe. All the circumstances connected with their history indicate that the Gnostic associations which appeared in France and Belgium in the beginning of the 11th century, came through Italy from Thrace. Their first appearance in France was, simultaneously, at Orleans and Arras, in the first of which places they were planted by an Italian woman, and in the latter by an Italian named Gandolfo.*

The progress in Western Europe of the sects which took, subsequently, the names of Albigenes, Cathari, or Puritani, Luciferians, Paterenes, &c., and with whom at a later period a large portion of the Waldenses became partially identified, caused the establishment of the first so-called INQUISITION; and it is indispensable that we should inquire into their character, and the relation they bore to both Church and State, in order to estimate the merit or demerit of that institution. The various appellations by which they were distinguished, had their origin in nick-names bestowed by popular caprice, names of places or of individuals, or even of qualities which they pretended to possess; but there existed no difference whatever among them in their fundamental Manichæan principles.†

* Hurter, Geschichte Pabst Innocenz des Dritten, II. Band. S. 210; Döllinger, Unpublished Researches. It was, we believe, Dr. Döllinger's intention to have published, many years since, an elaborate work on the heresies of the Middle Ages, for which he had gathered ample materials from archives scattered through various libraries of Europe. It is to be regretted that the result of his valuable labours should be withheld from the public. A part of the historical data in the present article is derived from proof-sheets of a small portion of the third volume of Dr. Döllinger's "Lehrbuch," kindly given by him long ago to the writer.

† The errors of the Waldenses included, originally, no part of the fundamental doctrines of the Manichæans. They were more nearly allied in their teaching and practice to the ancient Donatists; but, within fifty years of the time of Peter Waldo, their founder, common hatred against the Church of Rome had so closely united them with the Albigenes of the South of France that Hurter says (*Innoc. III.*, 2 Band, S. 225) they formed but one party,

History relates that those heretics, who were first discovered in the year 1022, at Orleans, denied the Catholic doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, rejected the necessity of Baptism, asserted the eternal existence of the world, thought that God did not punish for sins of sensuality, and that by the imposition of hands all sins were forgiven and the gifts of the Holy Ghost imparted. They practised demon-worship, and in their nocturnal assemblies committed the disgraceful debaucheries peculiar to the Manichæan sects.* They commenced their religious rites by chanting litanies to long lists of devils, until a toad, a cat, or some other small beast which they supposed to be a demoniac incarnation, appeared in their midst. The lights were then extinguished, and they delivered themselves up to the most sacrilegious and even incestuous orgies. If a child were born in consequence of their mutual crimes, it was burnt on the eighth day. Its ashes were considered holy relics, and, by a species of cannibalism, were administered internally, as a cure for all diseases.† When their existence was first discovered to King Robert of France, by Count

and their similarity of practice and teaching precluded the possibility of distinguishing between them. Contemporary writers confound the two sects, and *Ebrard, contra Waldenses*, does not discriminate between the Waldenses and the Cathari. This was greatly owing to the habit of dissimulation common to both; but more ignorant sectaries were probably themselves unaware of the respective tendencies of the two heresies. Yet the Inquisitors usually found the Waldenses less guilty than the Albigenses, and they were, says *Hallam* (p. 506), dealt with more leniently on that account. It is nevertheless recorded in the *Gesta Trevirorum* (vid. *Binterim's Deutsche Concilien*, Bd. iv. S. 296) that the Waldenses at Treves were addicted to the same crimes as the Cathari; that "some asserted that incest could be absolved for eighteen denars," practised demon-worship, &c. To conceal themselves, they gave their Bishop, who appears to have presided in common over Albigenses, Cathari, and Waldenses, the same name as the Catholic Bishop of the diocese, Theodoric, and elected a Pope with the name of the Roman Pope, Gregory; so that when asked what they believed they could truly reply that they held the same faith with Pope Gregory and their Bishop Theodoric. See also *Die christliche Mystik, von Görres*, Band iii. S. 54, for extracts made by Dollinger from the Acts of the Inquisition, in the Imperial Library at Paris, which clearly prove that the Waldenses of Artois were likewise devil-worshippers, and guilty of many atrocities. The Waldenses were everywhere peculiarly obnoxious to the legal authorities, because they rebelliously asserted, according to *Reiner*, that "princes and judges were damned who condemned malefactors." They agreed with those Protestant sects of the present day in scarcely any other respect than asserting the Church of Rome to be Antichrist. For a full refutation of the contrary theory, see *Maitland's Waldenses*, *Bossuet's Variations*, *Hurter*, and every respectable ecclesiastical history.

* *Dollinger*.

† *Gesta Synodi Aurelianensis*, c. ann. 1017, in *Dacherii Spicileg.*, t. i. pp. 604-606 (vid. *Görres*, Bd. iii. S. 42).

Richard, it was found that several of the most distinguished among the clergy belonged to the sect. After vain attempts had been made by a Synod, convoked at Orleans by the King, to convert them, the priests were degraded, and all were condemned to be burned. They, nevertheless, so confidently expected that evil spirits would preserve them from the flames, that when they felt the fire they cried out that they had been cheated by the Devil. The sectarians at Arras were less stubborn, and were all, when discovered, converted by the Bishop of that city.* Eight years later, between 1028-30, an association of Manichæans was discovered by the Archbishop of Milan, which added to the other errors of the sect the belief that a violent death was absolutely essential to salvation; so that they committed suicide rather than die of any disease. These deluded wretches, in spite of the protestations of the Archbishop, and his utmost endeavours to save them, were seized upon by the Milanese nobility, and without exception executed.† By order of Henry III. other Gnostics were executed, in 1052, at Goslar, in Germany; but from that time to the close of the eleventh century we have no further account of them in Western Europe.‡

In Eastern Europe, however, Manichæism was acquiring new strength and restored vigour. The sect of the Bogomiles—an offshoot of the Paulicians—originated, about this time, at Philippopolis. A most accurate account of the errors of these heretics, taken from the declaration of their chief at Constantinople, is left to us by the Monk Zigabenus, and it is difficult to imagine a more horrible medley of blasphemies, devil-worship, and systematized crime, than is afforded by that narration.§ Philippopolis, thenceforth, became a Gnostic metropolis, from which, after the beginning of the twelfth century, Manichæism was poured forth, by a thousand streams, into every nation and province in Europe.|| The Crusaders, especially, contributed to supply every town and fireside with Bogomile missionaries. Multitudes of corrupted visionaries, who had been seduced by the united charms of mystery, secrecy, and danger, returned to their homes, zealous to promulgate the religious obscenities and philosophically garbed blasphemies with which their minds had become poisoned. They brought with

* Döllinger.

† *Ib.*

‡ *Ib.*

§ *Wolfii Historia Bogomilorum*, Vitemberg, 1712, contains the Greek text of Zigabenus. (*Döllinger.*)

|| "From this settlement," says *Hallam*, "they silently promulgated their Manichæan creed over the Western regions of Christendom."—*Middle Ages*, p. ii. c. ix. 504.

them mysterious books and the most fantastical apocrypha, and painted in glowing colours the ravishing superiority over Christianity of the Eastern Association.*

In 1101 Manichæism reappeared in the south of France, in the diocese of Agen, and in 1115 it displayed itself in the diocese of Soissons, in the same revolting forms in which it had been condemned by the synod of Orleans a century previous. In 1121 it was introduced into Treves, and in 1144 into Lüttich.† About the year 1140 an admonition, by the Monk Heribert, against Gnostics in Perigord, appeared contemporaneously with a report, by the Provost Emerwin of Steinfelden, to S. Bernard, of the progress which their abominable intrigues were making in the diocese of Cologne. In 1166 thirty persons of the sect went over to England, where, upon being discovered, they were sentenced by the King to be branded, scourged, and banished.‡

The north of Italy and south of France were, however, the principal seats of the heresy, and it spread so secretly and effectually, that, at the close of the twelfth century, both civil and ecclesiastical governments were undermined by its innovations—innovations in their tendency more destructive to morality and civilization than Paganism itself. In 1167, encouraged by the ignorance and pusillanimity of the Catholic clergy, they boldly held an assembly at St. Felix of Caraman, near Toulouse, at which Niketas, an Oriental, a superior of the sect, administered the "*Consolamentum*," appointed bishops, parcelled out dioceses, and laid the foundation of a regular administrative system.§

And we see that, under whatever names they were known,

* *Evervini* Epist. in Bernardi Opp., i. 1492 (Döllinger). Gibbon says, "three different roads might introduce the Paulicians into the heart of Europe. The pilgrims who visited Jerusalem might safely follow the course of the Danube; in their journey and return they passed through Philippopolis; and the sectaries, disguising their name and heresy, might accompany the French or German caravans to their respective countries. Under the Byzantine standard, the Paulicians were often transported to Italy and Sicily. . . . and their opinions were silently propagated in Rome, Milan, and the kingdoms beyond the Alps. The trade and dominion of Venice pervaded the coast of the Adriatic, &c." (*Decline and Fall*, c. liv.) Hallam states, p. 504, that "the Paulicians may be traced up the Danube through Hungary and Bavaria, sometimes taking the route of Lombardy, into Switzerland and France. In the last country, and especially in its southern and eastern provinces, they became conspicuous under a variety of names; such as Catharists, Picards, Paterins, but above all, *Albigenses*." Hurter, *Binterim*, Görres, &c., trace the origin of Manichæism, in Europe, in the same manner.

† *Döllinger's* Lehrbuch.

‡ *Ib.*

§ *Ib.*

the different secret societies which sprung up in the twelfth century, in every part of Europe, were, indiscriminately, Manichæan sects.* In France they were called, from their origin, Bulgarians; in some parts of Italy, Publicans, a corruption of the word Paulicians; in the provinces, where they were most numerous, Provincials, or, after 1208, Albigenses, from the town of Albi in Languedoc; in the Milanese territory, Cathari, *i. e.* the Pure,† or Patarenes and Patarenians, a name they had usurped from the anti-simoniack church party in Milan;‡ in Belgium, Pippiler, or Weavers, from the trade many of them followed, and sundry other names; but the generic term Manichæans was given to them universally, and was accepted by themselves in their disputations with Catholics.§ According to Rainer Sacchoni, they numbered sixteen

* It would be impossible to give the names of all the sects into which they were subdivided. Among them, besides the above, were the Passaginians, Beghards, Sottulares, Sabbatati, Insabbatati, Turlupini, Apostolicans, Truants, Papelades, Stedingers, Sorciers, Runkarians, Sicards, Leonists, Ribaux, Speronists, Arnaldists, Albanians, Baranoles, Cornists, Ortholines, etc., etc. Reiner says (*Summa de Catharis*) there were over seventy kinds, and *Evvard* counts up a long list of names and opinions. *Hurter* states that during the Albigensian war, they were all known in Languedoc by the name of Albigenses. (*Vid. Hurter*, i. 212—225.) In Germany, on the contrary, some writers include Waldenses and Albigenses under the name of Beguins. (*Vid. Binterim*, iv. 319.)

† Thus *Döllinger*; but other writers derive the word Cathari differently. *Alamus de Insulis* makes it come *a catto*, from their worship of a cat. Thus *Hurter*, *Innoc. III. ii. 210*. Their name is connected by other authors with still worse crimes of which they were guilty. For explanation and undoubted proof of their cat worship, see *Binterim's Deutsche Concilien*, Bd. iv. S. 151, and extracts, by the same author, from *Alberici Trium Fontium Monachi Chron.*, ad ann. 1233, concerning the Luciferians (*ibid.*, p. 300).

‡ *Döllinger's Lehrbuch*.

§ See *Murdoch's Mosheim*, vol. ii. b. iii. pp. 256—266. In *Fletcher's* notes to *De Maistre's* first letter on the Inquisition, the following quotation from *Mosheim* is also given, which appears to have been omitted by his translators. "Certain writers," says *Mosheim*, "who have accustomed themselves to entertain a high idea of the sanctity of all those who, in the middle ages, separated themselves from the Church of Rome, suspect the inquisitors of having attributed falsely impious doctrines to the Albigenses. But this suspicion is entirely groundless. Their shocking violation of decency was a consequence of their pernicious system. They looked upon decency and modesty as marks of inward corruption. Certain enthusiasts among them maintained that the believer could not sin, let his conduct be ever so horrible and atrocious."—(*Ecl. Hist.*, vol. iii.) *Mosheim's* notes are the most valuable part of his work; yet a great portion of them have been omitted in the English translation, and others substituted in their place.

Hallam also rebukes those Protestant Church historians who deny the Manicheism of these sects. He says:—"The proof of Manicheism among the heretics of the twelfth century is so strong that I should never have thought of arguing the point, but for the confidence of some modern

central organizations : two at Constantinople, one of the Latins, and one of the Greeks ; four, Sclavonian, Bulgarian, Drugurian and Philadelphian, in the valley of the Danube ; six in Italy, of Concorregio, Bagnola, Treviso, Florence, Spoleto, and Albania ; and four in France—one in the north, and, in the south, those of Toulouse, Carcassone, and Albi.* With the exception of two, they were all dualistic. The organizations of Bagnola and Concorregio, which were what is now called monachist Manichæans, instead of holding with the rest that there is a God of darkness, co-eternal with and practically more powerful than the God of light, asserted that Lucifer is, indeed, inferior to God ; but, nevertheless, created the world, and is the Jehovah of the Old Testament.† Upon most other points they were agreed, unanimously rejecting all the sacraments, mysteries, and dogmas of the Christian religion,‡ refusing to accept the principal part of Scripture,§ forbidding marriage in such a manner that their precept led to the most degrading crimes, and, as Docetists, denying the reality of the existence of Jesus Christ.

Their social usages were the same. Their principal religious ceremony was the so-called "*Consolamentum*," a baptism of the Holy Ghost, which, as they rejected Baptism by water, was administered by the laying on of hands.|| The reception of the "*Consolamentum*" was the turning point in the life of a Manichee. From that moment, the consoled, consecrated, perfect, or pure, as they were differently styled, were supposed to dedicate themselves to a life of entire continence, abstemiousness, and mortification. They were obliged to abstain from marriage and animal food, could kill no fowl or quadruped, and,

ecclesiastical writers. What can we think of one who says, 'It was not unusual to stigmatize new sects with the odious name of Manichæans, though I know no evidence that there were any real remains of that sect in the twelfth century.' (*Milner's History of the Church*, iii. 380.) The tenets ascribed to them by all contemporary authorities coincide so remarkably with those held by the Paulicians, and in earlier times by the Manichæans, that I do not see how we can reasonably deny what is confirmed by separate and uncontradictory testimonies."—*Europe during the Middle Ages*, c. ix. p. 504.

* Apud Döllinger.

† *Ibid.*

‡ Vid. Hurter, II. Bd. S. 216. They called Baptism a snare of the Devil, maintained that oaths were sinful (217—231), and that the other sacraments were deceitful and Satanic.—Döllinger.

§ Hurter, *ibid.* S. 215—219. They ridiculed every part of the Old Testament, and the Albigenses, at the storming of Beziers, threw the Bible from the walls of the city, with disgusting circumstances of ignominy, and with the words, "Here, you rascals, take your law."

|| The *Consolamentum* was usually preceded by a public confession of past sins.—Hurter, *ibid.* s. 220.

in case of perseverance, considered themselves entitled to eternal happiness.* As, however, the greater number of the sect preferred remaining in the lower and more comfortable rank of simple "Believers," the "*Consolamentum*" was rarely bestowed except in danger of death, a delay which gave rise to one of the most frightful atrocities of which they were guilty. To provide against the inconstancy of the patient, the "*Endura*" was introduced, which originated in the already mentioned Manichæan theory of the advantage of a violent and voluntary death. The "*Endura*" consisted in starving the sufferer to death, opening his veins, or depriving him of life in some other unnatural way. It is related by Pseudo-Rainer that the question was put to the sick man, whether he preferred being a martyr or a confessor. If he replied the former, he was strangled; and if the latter, his death was hastened by starvation.† This hideous delusion prevailed to so great an extent that parents exposed their children and children their parents to the "*Endura*," in order to hasten them to a happy end.‡

Rainer, who wrote in the middle of the thirteenth century, and who had been himself, for sixteen years, a Manichæan, relates that at his time there were not altogether four thousand perfect or consoled of both sexes in the whole sect, but that it contained legions of simple believers.§ The great excitement for these was that they could surrender themselves fearlessly to unbridled licence and debauchery, in the dream that laying on of hands would ultimately cancel every sin. Rainer remarks that he never, in a single instance, during his sixteen years of discipleship, met a member of the sect who appeared troubled on account of the infamies he had perpetrated; but that he heard many of the "consoled" lament that they had not indulged more licentiously whilst they had been "believers."||

All of the sect regarded oaths as sinful, and incest as no worse than marriage;¶ and the records which remain of the frightful judicial processes of the age, testify to what appalling enormities this execrable error gave rise.** The "believers,"

* Döllinger.

† For many examples, see *Liber Sententiar. Inquisitionis Tolosanæ* (apud Limborch, Hist. Inquis.), pp. 33, 104, 154, 143.—Hurter, II. Band, S. 223.—Also Döllinger.

‡ Hefele, in *Wetzer und Welte*, I. Band, Albigenser, S. 144.

§ Reineri Summa ap. d'Argentré, Collect. Judicior, i. 51.

|| Hurter, Geschichte Pabst Innocenz des Dritten, II. Bd. S. 223.

¶ Hurter, II. Bd. S. 223; Binterim, IV. Bd. S. 287-290, &c.; and Döllinger.

** Hurter, *ibid.*, S. 214, 219, 238. He quotes Lucas Tudensis adv. Albigeneses, Hugo ep. Rothm., S. Bernhard, &c., as asserting their debaucheries. The incestuous orgies of the Manichæans are described by writers of the

however, were not the only transgressors, for the "consoled," if they fell, could be restored again to their purity by a renewal of the "Consolamentum."* A bull of Gregory IX., in 1229, bears testimony to the fact that the devil-worship which we have already mentioned was notorious in his time; and that, in their assemblies, they looked for the real or pretended appearance of a demon, in the shape of a toad, cat, or some other beast.† They treated the Bible with most shameful indecency, and records have been left us of filthy desecrations of the sacred volume, particularly by the Albigenes, which may not be thought of, much less repeated.‡ They utterly rejected the hallowing of the first day of the week, asserting that Sunday was no better than any other day.§

12th and 13th centuries, wholly independent of each other, and in every part of Europe. For the hideously profligate history of Tanquelin, and the crowds of disciples he drew after him in the whole country of Utrecht, see *Balmes*, p. 250, and the record taken from contemporary sources in *Binterim's* "Deutsche Concilien," IV. Bd. S. 141. The Abbot *Trithem*, "Chronic. Hirsang. ad ann. 1163, apud Binterim," relates of the Manichæans near Cologne, that no imaginable licentious excess was regarded by them as sinful. "Allegantes illud Apostoli: *omnia munda mundi*. Ob id quoque se mundos et Spiritu S. plenos, quidquid facere, non peccare dicebant." *Rainer*, cap. vi. 30, says of the Runkarians, that since Christ only condemned sin as proceeding from the heart, they accounted its external commission no sin at all. This last opinion was held by many Manichæan sects. (Vide *Binterim*, IV. Bd. S. 287-290.) *Trithem* records of the Manichæans of Strasbourg, called Rustards, that they practised community of women as of goods. (Vide *Binterim*, loc. cit. S. 290.)

* Vide *Hurter*, II. Band, S. 220, and *Döllinger*. The "Consolamentum" was not only renewed after the "consoled" had sinned, but also when doubt arose concerning the sanctity of the *Consolator*, the name given to the performer of the ceremony. This latter belief, that the services of any other than a perfect *Consolator* were unavailing, caused a frequent laying on of hands among the "perfect" themselves.

† Vide *Binterim*, IV. Band, S. 299, 300, 302, 303, and *Görres*, "Christliche Mystik, III. Band, S. 31, 42, 54, &c., for the most odious details of this obscene worship. See also the answer of Pope Gregory IX. (*Raynald*, "Annal. Eccles. ad Ann. 1232," N. viii.) to the Archbishops of Cologne, Mayence, and Trèves. In Bremen, the government and bishop petitioned the Pope to interfere against certain Manichæans who adored the devil, under the name of Asmodeus, as the God of liberty. "Illi fuerunt sectatores heresum, adoraverunt Asmodeum, id est Diabolum" (*Walter*, "Chronic. Bremens."). "Ante victoriam posuerunt idolum Asmodei ad occidentem et in contentum Dei adoraverunt. Idolum etiam Ammon in ecclesiam S. Ægidii statuerunt," "Chronic. Rasted." p. 98. (Vide *Binterim*, IV. Band, S. 312.) Some of the accounts of devil-worship given by *Binterim*, from annals of the 12th and 13th century, are too shocking for repetition.

‡ *Hurter*, III. Bd. S. 215, 222, &c.

§ They denied, in fact, the necessity of any external worship whatsoever. Vide *Hefele*, in "Wetzer und Welte," I. B. Albigen, S. 144. *Hurter*, II. B. S. 230.

That crime, however, which, above all others, rendered these Manichæan sects dangerous, and not only aided in their rapid propagation, but contributed to their preservation, was their inculcated hypocrisy.* So long as they could find impunity, their arrogance knew no bounds. They assassinated priests, polluted churches and sacred utensils, drove bishops from their sees, openly rebelled against the State, and the filthiest and most obscene sacrileges were those in which they delighted the most.† But as soon as they apprehended danger, they crowded to the churches, remained there for hours on their knees, received the sacraments, and asseverated that they were the purest of Christians. They were true to the principle which they had inherited, that secrecy and deceit became virtues when used against their enemies.‡

Thus Manichæism menaced Europe. Every province had become filled with disciples of a monstrous devil-worship, which set up as virtues, murder, patricide, matricide, infanticide, and even cannibalism; in which incest and every species of revolting debauchery were unscrupulously practised; in which morality was scoffed and jeered at; in which adoration of the devil was blasphemously substituted for the worship of Christ;§ in which every private tie in life was severed, every sacred object desecrated, vice exalted, and conscience annihilated; in which every human right was trampled upon, every duty of citizenship despised; and the first principles of which made its adherents, if it suited them, perjured traitors in every Christian state and perfidious enemies of the Christian Church. And all this, varnished over with falsehood and subtle deceit, with full privilege to pretend to abhor and repudiate the tenets which their existence was dedicated to support.

Truly, it was no time for states to be imbecile, or for the Church to be sluggish. Swift action, in searching out and converting, or extirpating these more monstrous savages than the devotees of Juggernaut, was urgent and indispensable, in order to save Europe from the most loathsome paganism that

* *Hurter*, II. Bd. S. 220, 221, 223, 233, details of some of the arts to which they resorted for concealment.

† *Hurter*, *ibid*, S. 222. *Balmes*, p. 252, cites an eye-witness, Stephen, Abbot of St. Geneviève, "who describes to the king, who had sent him to Toulouse, the acts of violence committed by these sectaries: 'I have seen on all sides,' he says, 'churches burnt and ruined to their foundations: I have seen the dwellings of men changed into the dens of wild beasts.'"

‡ *Hurter*, *ibid*, S. 223.

§ *Hurter* states that before a person was fully admitted to their sects, he was obliged solemnly to abjure the Christian faith.

ever had menaced civilization. If there be on earth an infallible Church, and she neglects to come forward now, let her never dare to raise her voice in the world again. If the State does not smite with a keenly-sharpened sword, and the Church hesitates to thunder forth its anathemas in such a crisis, they must answer to God and mankind for the perdition of the world and the re-enthralment of Christendom in barbarism. Infallible truth never was more urgently called upon to denounce what is infallibly wrong, and to raise a barrier against crimes, for which God might justly doom a universe to destruction.

In fact, it was effectually to meet the exigences of that critical time, and to uproot Manichæism, in spite of the wiles, subterfuges, and hypocrisy to which it resorted for concealment, that the Church established the court of investigation which has since been known by the name of the INQUISITION.

Previous to the thirteenth century, it had never been deemed necessary to commit the trial of heretics to an especially appointed and permanent tribunal. The heresy was condemned by a council, synod, or episcopal court, and those who contumaciously adhered to it were prosecuted and punished by the civil authorities. But the inefficacy of the first celebrated edict against them proved that extraordinary means were requisite in order to withstand the progress of the Manichæans. This edict was issued in 1179 by the Eleventh Ecumenical Council, under Alexander III. It excommunicated the Cathari, Patarenes, and Publicans near Albi and Toulouse for seducing "weak and silly people" into their errors, and condemned in Aragon, Navarre, and the Biscayan provinces, similar heretics, who had been guilty of cruelties "in which they spared neither churches, widows, nor orphans," to confiscation of property and serfdom, in case they persisted in such crimes; exhorting the faithful to repel with arms their violence.*

The Conference of Verona, held in 1182 or 1183, before Lucius III. and the Emperor Frederic Barbarossa, gives the first indications of a consciousness that the secret crimes of the Manichæans could only be reached by an authorized system of inquiry. It directed the Bishops to visit personally, or by their Archdeacons, the infected parts of their dioceses, and to bind by oath three or four men of integrity to seek out and make known to them all persons who frequented secret associa-

* *Hardouin, Collectio Concil., t. vi. P. i. p. 1683.*

tions, or exhibited singularity in their religious opinions. It again published the ban against the different sectaries, preachers of heresy, and those who should harbour them, condemning heretical priests to be degraded, and all heretics who should refuse to recant their errors, to be delivered over to the secular arm. It was enjoined, however, that even relaxed heretics should be pardoned if they repented of their crimes.*

The Twelfth Œcumenical Council, the fourth of Lateran, under Innocent III., in 1215, energetically reprobates the infamous practices of the Manichæans, and prescribes as a strict duty, that the Bishops should make inquisitorial visitations in their respective territories.† The germs of the Court of the Inquisition, which was established twelve years later, at the close of the war against the Albigenses, were contained in these judicial journeys.

In the beginning of the thirteenth century no part of Europe had become so undermined by heresy as the south of France, where the Manichæans were either protected or their tenets adopted by powerful nobles, like Raymond VI., of Toulouse, and where even the Catholic Episcopate and clergy were too apathetic or wicked to oppose them. Michaud, whose testimony is the more valuable because of his avowed enmity to the Inquisition, says:—"Tous ceux à qui leurs passions rendaient insupportables le frein des lois humaines, vinrent à la fin se ranger sous les bannières des novateurs (les Albigeois), et furent accueillis par une secte avide de s'agrandir, de se fortifier, et toujours disposée à regarder, comme ses partisans et ses défenseurs, les hommes que la société rejetait de son sein, qui redoutaient la justice et ne pouvaient supporter l'ordre établi. Ainsi les prétendus réformateurs du treizième siècle, en proclamant le triomphe de la vérité et de la vertu, admettaient dans leur sein la corruption et la license, détruisaient toute espèce de règle et d'autorité, abandonnaient tout au caprice des passions, ne laissaient aucun lien à la société, aucune force à la morale, aucun frein à la multitude."‡

Innocent III. was too wise a pontiff to imagine that under such circumstances force alone could be an adequate remedy for the evil. He therefore appointed in Languedoc, Peter of Chateauneuf, the Abbot Arnold of Citeaux, and a lay brother named Rudolph, three Cistercians of unquestioned virtue and ability, as his legates, and as missionaries to instruct and convert the people. Teaching was their principal occupation ;

* *Harduin*, *Collectio Concil.*, t. vi. P. i. pp. 1878-1880.

† *Ibid.*, t. vii. pp. 19-22.

‡ *Michaud*, *Histoire des Croisades*, t. iii. l. xii. p. 375.

but they were also invested with plenary power to rouse bishops and civil authorities to the performance of their duty; were ordered to excommunicate them if negligent, and in every respect to make such dispositions as they deemed would most effectually suppress the heresy.*

In 1206 they were reinforced by twelve other Cistercian abbots, the Spanish bishop, Diego of Osma, and his priest Domingo Guzman. The last of these, who subsequently founded the order of the Friar-Preachers, was the renowned S. Dominic, whom many friends and enemies have falsely asserted to have been the first Grand Inquisitor. There is not a particle of evidence that S. Dominic was, even indirectly, concerned in the establishment of the Inquisition, which was not founded until after his death. He was simply an ardent, enthusiastic preacher of the Catholic faith, who did not even share the authority of the three legates. His great fame is owing to his superiority in zeal, talents, and success, over his co-labourers.†

The peaceable endeavours of these missionaries were frustrated by the violence of their adversaries. In the year 1208, Peter of Chateauneuf was butchered by the heretical nobility. The last words spoken by this saintly man, to an assassin who plunged a sword in his side, were: "May God pardon thee, my friend, as I pardon thee."‡ The indignation which this deed excited, extended throughout all Europe, and it was resolved upon, by Pope Innocent III. and the King of France, to oppose violence to violence. War was declared, and an army, under the Legate Milo and Count Simon of Montfort, marched, in 1209, against the Albigenses.§ There never was a more just war more cruelly provoked,|| and if these two commanders had possessed the proper qualifications, it might have been the means of averting from Europe great future misery. But their selection was very unfortunate. Count Simon is accused by historians of having conducted the war to subserve

* *Hefele*, *Der Cardinal Ximenes*, S. 247, 248. *Hurter*, Bd. ii. S. 276-282.

† *Ibid.*, ut sup. S. 248.

‡ *Fleury*, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, l. lxxvii., § xxxvi.

§ *Hefele*, in *Welte und Wetzler*, *Albigenser*, I. Bd. S. 144.

|| *Balmes*, p. 255, says that the Albigenses "associated with the celebrated bandits called Cottareaux, and feared not to commit all sorts of excesses, as they had seduced some knights, and had secured the protection of some seigneurs of the country of Toulouse. They succeed in exciting a formidable insurrection which could be repressed only by force of arms."—*Michaud*, t. iii. p. 377, says, "Innocent was compelled to join the crusade, perhaps by the opinion of the entire age."

his own private ambition, and the Papal Legate of having lacked the courage to withstand him. A man of more energy, however, who was sent by Innocent III. to replace the latter, certainly found reasons for approving the terrible severity attributed to the Count; but the Pope, inclined to mercy even against the representations of his own agents, protected the Manichæan leader, Count Raymond of Toulouse, from the violence of the army arrayed against him. The contest became, at length, a political one, and did not close until the year 1227;* but the issue had so long been held doubtful by the Albigenses themselves, that, when their country was subdued, heresy had become more malignant and atrociously criminal than it had ever been before, and the necessity had increased of effectually opposing the evils with which it menaced society. The hypocrisy of its adherents kept such equal pace with their infernal orgies and hellish crimes, that it was difficult to bring them to justice, even where their excesses were most notorious.

In the year 1229, therefore, the tribunal of the INQUISITION was formally established. A great Synod was held, in that year, at Toulouse, in the presence of Cardinal Romanus, Legate of Gregory IX., to determine what measures should be adopted to avert a renewal of civil war and the anarchy which everywhere impended, and to bring to justice the hordes of cunning malefactors who, in the name of religion, were spreading corruption throughout the land. It was fortunate for Europe that this Council, or, rather, ecclesiastico-political Congress, was composed of men, experienced in the malignity of the evils to be corrected, alive to the importance of the emergency, and endowed with wisdom to meet it. The ecclesiastical provinces of Bordeaux and Auch were represented by their Bishops and clergy, and the greater part of the nobility of the South of France, including the Counts of Toulouse and Foix, who had formerly protected the Albigenses, assisted at its deliberations.†

The first proceeding of the Synod was to establish Episcopal courts of Inquisition, and accurately to define the jurisdiction they should possess. It commanded, in the first chapter of regulations against heresy, that each Archbishop and Bishop should appoint a priest, and two, three, or more laymen, of piety and good repute, whom they should bind under oath to search out diligently heretics, and their aiders, concealers, and protectors, and designate them to the Bishop, Lord of the manor, or their officials.

* *Hefele*, bei Welte und Wetzler, ut sup.

† *Ibid.*, S. 249.

Chapter the second made similar provision for the districts of exempted Abbots.

In chapters three, four, and five, the obligation was imposed upon the temporal princes of extirpating heresy in their territories, under penalty of having them confiscated if they wilfully harboured it, or of expiating in some milder way its having been introduced, if owing to their sluggishness or neglect.

Chapter six ordered every house, in which a heretic should be found, to be torn down.

In chapter seven, it was decreed that remissness on the part of officials, in the prosecution of heretics, should be punished. In order, however, to obviate the effects of slanderous and unjust accusations, it was provided, in chapter eight, that no criminal should suffer punishment until he had been examined by the Bishop or his properly appointed delegate, and declared by him to be guilty of the crime of heresy.

Chapter ten ordained that whosoever freely abjured his heresy should remove into an uninfected district, be intrusted with no public charge, and wear two coloured crosses upon his vesture, until pronounced absolved from penance by the Pope or his Legate. If his conversion had been the evident result of fear, the Bishop might, by chapter eleven, keep him under arrest, to prevent his seducing others; the expenses of his imprisonment to be defrayed either by himself or the Bishop.

In chapter twelve, males over fourteen, and females over twelve years of age, were required to take, biennially, an oath that they would be faithful to their religion, and denounce heretics to the authorities.

Chapter thirteen declared that those who did not confess their sins and receive communion three times a year,—viz. at Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost,—should be held suspected of heresy. In consequence of the sacrilegious indignities with which the Albigenses had treated the Bible, and, as Hurter remarks,* of the shameful manner in which their pretended translations had caricatured the text, chapter fourteen interdicted to laymen its use in the vernacular, and allowed them to possess no more of the Latin version than the Psalms and Breviary.†

Chapter sixteen prohibited heretics from practising medicine, and ordered that heretics when sick should not be attended by

* Hurter, *Innoc. III.*, Bd. ii. S. 247.

† The Breviary with its lessons, especially as it was used at that time, included nearly the whole of the Sacred Scriptures.

a physician.* It is probable that this last law was originally intended to guard against the awful crimes of the "Endura."

These are the laws for the establishment of the Inquisition, and the rules which were given at that time for its guidance; and when we take into view the frightful evils they were intended to counteract, and the state of Europe, then entirely destitute of a preventive and detective police, we must admit that they were far from being too severe. The vigour with which they were executed undoubtedly prevented a renewal of civil hostilities in the south of France; and the fact that the Manichæan heresy succumbed before them is a proof that they were wisely adapted to the age in which they were enacted.

Two years after the Synod of Toulouse, the Roman Senate introduced the Inquisition into Italy, where the Manichees were scarcely less pernicious to society than in Provence and Languedoc.† Even the Emperor, Frederic II., who was unfavourable to Papal influence, had issued two edicts, one at his coronation in 1220, and another in 1224,‡ in which he condemned them to be delivered to the flames. A bull was, therefore, issued by Gregory IX. in 1231, excommunicating these heretics and all who should harbour them, declaring them dishonoured and incapable of holding office, and forbidding their giving testimony, or bequeathing or inheriting property.§ It did not allude to the Inquisition, but it was the cause of its immediate establishment by the Senate at Rome, in a decree wherein are, for the first time, named the "*inquisitores ab Ecclesia dati*." Gregory sent this decree, with his bull, to the Archbishop of Milan and his suffragans, as well as to other Italian prelates, exhorting them to adopt similar measures.||

Very soon after this time, by the side of the Episcopal Courts of Inquisition, we find similar institutions arising under the direction of the Friars of S. Dominic. The exact period when the Dominicans acquired their jurisdiction is uncertain; but their energy, experience, and superior wisdom in dealing with heretics very early acquired for them the unlimited confidence of the bishops.¶ The peculiar object of their founder, to train up an army of preachers against heresy, had been so successfully attained, that Pope Honorius III. recom-

* *Hardouin*, t. vii. pp. 173-178.

† *Raynald*, *Contin. Annal. Baronii*, ad ann. 1231; n. 18 et 20.

‡ *Sporschi's Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche*, II. Band, S. 512, 627.—*Raynald*, l. c. n. 18.

§ *Raynald*, l. c. n. 14, 15.

¶ *Hefele*, *Cardinal Ximenes*, S. 252.

|| *Ibid.*, n. 18 et 20.

mended them to all bishops for that office.* It is, however, probable that the bishops themselves had selected them from the beginning, in preference to other priests, as coadjutors in the work imposed upon them by the Synod of Toulouse. Their great zeal in withstanding the Manichæans in the Milanese territory in 1233 had brought them into especial favour with Gregory IX., who assigned to them the duty of reconciling heretics to the Church in many Italian towns.† They were, nevertheless, generally associated, in this task, with Benedictines, or other priests, until the time of Innocent IV., when they acquired their highest power.

The Spanish provinces of Aragon and Navarre had become, through their contiguousness to France, so infected with the corruption of Manichæanism that Alphonsus II. issued a severe edict against it as early as 1194.‡ This edict was renewed by the successor of King Peter II., of Arragon, in 1213.§ Peter II. himself had been killed that year at the battle of Muret, having taken arms for the Albigenses in the ranks of the Count of Toulouse against the French and Papal troops.|| After the Synod of Toulouse, Esparrago, the Archbishop of Tarragona, and his suffragans were called upon by Gregory IX. either to proceed vigorously themselves against the heretics, or to permit the Friar-Preachers to do so.¶ They were accordingly introduced immediately after as Inquisitors, first into Lerida, and then into the rest of Spain,** where their activity and success procured them the highest commendation from the prelates of the age.†† In a Brief, therefore, to Raymond of Pennafort, dated October 20, 1248, Innocent IV., who as early as 1243 had appointed them Inquisitors for all Italy, except Naples, transferred to the Dominican tribunals power equal to that which had been previously possessed by the bishops alone. The Pope declared that he committed the care of extirpating heresy to the Dominicans, because they had been manifestly raised up by Providence for that purpose,

* *Raynald*, l. c. ad ann. 1219, n. 55. † *Ibid.*, ad ann. 1233, n. 59.

‡ *Llorente*, *Hist. de l'Inquis.*, t. i. p. 30, n. xi. § *Ibid.*, p., 31, n. xii.

|| *Llorente*, t. i. l. c.; and *Hurter*, *Geschichte Pabst Innocenz des Dritten*, II. Band, S. 525-531.

¶ *Llorente*, l. c. t. i. p. 67, n. ii.

** *Ibid.*, p. 6, n. iii.

†† According to *Matthew Paris* (*Hist. major*, p. 271, ed. Paris, 1644), the Albigenses became, in 1234, quite powerful in Spain. They possessed several strong places, and had drawn together a numerous army of soldiers, who burned churches, and massacred Catholics of every age and both sexes. They were finally defeated in battle and dispersed; but it is evident and worthy of note that their vicinity to the Moors, among whom kindred Manichæan sects existed, whose aid they could count upon, was a principal cause of their considerable number and strength.

and because he had already experienced the great efficacy of their labours in behalf of the Church; and he therefore commanded S. Raymond to appoint Inquisitors among them for that part of Arragon which belonged to the ecclesiastical province of Narbonne.*

From the time of Innocent IV. Dominican tribunals began to supersede all others. S. Louis caused them to be founded throughout France in 1255; in 1257 Premislaus, King of Bohemia, introduced them into his dominions; and their existence in the republic of Venice was confirmed by the Pope in 1289;† so that, within sixty years from its first establishment, the Inquisition had been introduced into nearly every province of Europe, and the Friar-Preachers had become everywhere the ordinary Inquisitors.

The tribunals of the Inquisition were governed, for seventeen years, by the rules laid down by the Synod of Toulouse; but, two years and a half before the Brief of Innocent IV., just mentioned, they had received very important modifications. On the 19th of April, 1246, a Council was held at Béziers by William de la Broue, Archbishop of Narbonne, and his six suffragan bishops, at which the Dominican Inquisitors, who had already been entrusted by the Pope with the provinces of Arles, Aix, and Embrun, demanded new instructions as to the manner in which they should exercise their judicial functions.‡ The original system of inquisitorial courts in each parish had nearly disappeared, and the old rules which governed them were no longer adapted to the recent method of holding tribunals in the larger towns only. At the command of Innocent IV., who was then in France, whither he had fled from the Emperor Frederic II., thirty-seven articles were drawn up by the Synod, which, within a few years, became the definite standard by which inquisitorial proceedings were afterwards conducted.

The substance of these articles is as follows:—The Inquisitors were directed to assemble the clergy and people in some central place within the district allotted to them; and, after preaching a sermon, to publish the powers with which they had been invested. They were then to command all persons who knew themselves, or others, to be guilty of heresy, to come forward within an assigned period, which was called the

* The Brief of Innocent is in *Mansi*, Collect. Concil., t. xxiii.

† *Hefele*, in *Welte und Wetzler*, Band v. S. 658. The Holy Office was first established in Venice by the Doges in 1249, but did not receive Papal confirmation until forty years later. It ceased to exist in 1797.

‡ *Sporschil's Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche*, Bd. ii. S. 629.

"*time of grace*," and avow the truth. Those who obeyed this mandate were to be exempted from capital punishment, imprisonment for life, banishment, and confiscation of property. After they had been examined under oath, their confessions and depositions were to be recorded by a public person, and the abjuration of those who desired to re-enter the Church was to be received with a promise that they would in future denounce heretics and assist in their prosecution. Those heretics who did not avail themselves of the *time of grace* were to be summoned by name, informed of the accusations that had been made against them, and allowed ample time to prepare and freedom to make their defence. If they could not refute these charges, and should, moreover, obstinately persist in the denial of their guilt, they were to be condemned. Avowed heretics were to be examined privately, in presence of a select number of judicious Catholics, and to be induced, if possible by mildness, to abandon their errors. If contumacious, they were themselves to state publicly their heresy; after which the sentence of their condemnation was to be pronounced, and they were then to be surrendered to the civil magistrates. Relapsed heretics, fugitives from justice, such as had not appeared within the time of grace, and those who had suppressed the truth, were to be condemned to perpetual imprisonment. With the approbation of the Bishop, however, this punishment could after a time be remitted, provided security were given that the penance imposed would be performed. Prisoners were to be confined separately, in order that they might neither corrupt each other, nor easily communicate with out-door accomplices. Those who were spared from imprisonment were either to enlist temporarily in the crusades against the Saracens, or find substitutes, or to preach against heresy and the enemies of the Church. They were to wear two crosses upon their garments, one before and the other behind; to assist on Sundays and festival days at mass and the Vesper sermon, and to stand during the Epistle and Gospel, with rods in their hands, before the priest, and if he should inflict the discipline upon them, the heresy for which it was done was to be proclaimed to the people. The property of heretics condemned to death or to imprisonment for life was to be confiscated to the public treasury.*

These instructions of the Synod of Béziers were for some years followed only by the Inquisitor of France, and when the Brief of Innocent IV. was issued in favour of the Dominicans in 1248, Raymond of Pennafort was commanded by the Pope

* *Sporschil*, Band ii. S. 629-630.

to continue in Aragon the use of the rules which had been made in 1229 by the Council of Toulouse;* but on the 15th of May, 1252, Pope Innocent, then in Perugia, issued thirty-eight paragraphs of statutes, substantially identical with those of Béziers, by which all approved tribunals in Europe were ever after governed.† How effectually these laws operated is sufficiently indicated by the fact that thenceforth the names of Manichæan sects begin gradually to disappear from the history of Europe. They are rarely mentioned after the commencement of the fourteenth century, and about a hundred years after the Inquisition was founded they had passed away, and we hear of them no more.

From the middle of the thirteenth century to the commencement of the fourteenth, the Inquisition vigorously exercised its prerogatives; but, with the extinction of the cause for which it had been created, its influence rapidly decayed. The anti-Catholic Limborch says that, in France, which had been the chief seat of its power, "it dropped of itself, for want of heresies to proceed against,"‡ and its decline there was so speedy that, in 1312, it was transformed, by Philip the Fair into a Royal tribunal for the annihilation of the Knights Templars.§ "In Italy, and in Rome itself," Puigblanch, in his "Inquisition Unmasked," admits that "the Inquisition soon declined."|| Urban IV., in 1263, instituted a "*Congregatio Sacri Officii*," by which the Church tribunals of all lands were to be regulated, the chief occupation of which soon became confined to the censure of books. In Burgundy, also, Limborch relates that the Inquisition soon came, by degrees, to nothing, for want of heretics to prosecute.¶ It lasted in the kingdom of Aragon for above a century, until the death of Nicholas Eymerick, in 1393.** From that time, we learn from Llorente, that there, too, it gradually sank of itself.

When we reflect that the end which this tribunal had in view was war against an army of secret enemies, who were by profession criminals of the blackest dye, and subverters, for conscience sake as they feigned, of morality, virtue, and order; when we consider that not only the faith of the Church and the purity of its members were attacked, but that the success of the Manichæan sects would have caused the over-

* *Hefele*, Der Card. Ximenes, S. 255.

† *Hardouin*, Collect. Concil. t. vii. pp. 354-360.

‡ *Limborch*, Hist. of the Inquis., ch. xiv. p. 87.

§ *Hefele*, bei Welte und Wetzer, Bd. v. S. 658.

|| *Inquisition Unmasked*, p. 13. ¶ *Limborch*, ch. xiv. p. 87.

** *Hefele*, Cardinal Ximenes, S. 255.

throw of every government in Europe, and reduced it to worse than savage anarchy, we cannot sufficiently admire the wisdom and mercy with which its laws were framed, nor the happy issue of their administration.

The principal object of the Inquisition was to bring to light hidden crime. The Manichæans formed an enormous body of secret criminals, who considered themselves justified in exchanging, in a moment, the most beastly and incestuous orgies to which the fanaticism of devil-worship could instigate, for plausible professions of attachment to the Church; and whose most potent weapon, in the service of their infernal master, consisted in counterfeiting piety and uniting execrable crimes to the semblance of the purest Christianity. There is no possibility of exaggeration on this subject; for, throughout this whole article, decency has compelled us to omit the worst, and to remain very far indeed behind the truth. The testimony of contemporary historians is too explicit and uncontradictory to be entirely denied, even by those historians who have been most eager to malign the Popes; and the archives of the Inquisition, which may still be consulted at Paris, Vienna, and Rome, teem with crimes unfolded before that tribunal which would evoke a deluge of indignation if they were to be now perpetrated in any civilized nation. This is proved by the summary proceedings of the Prussian police with a society of Manichæans called Mucker, which was discovered in Königsberg, in 1835, and by the *utter extermination* in Norway, fifteen years ago, of a like sect, whose vile practices outraged the neighbourhood in which they lived.*

Nevertheless, the spirit of the Inquisition, in direct opposition to the spirit of the State, was that of the most ingenious mercy that wisdom and piety could devise consistently with the firmness required to attain its object. Its great and distinctive characteristic, as an ecclesiastical tribunal, was its endeavour to reclaim heretics by persuasion and the assurance of pardon. Whilst civil officers sought out culprits to punish them, the Inquisitors strove, by converting them, to shelter them from the severity of the laws, and to protect them from the vengeance of the secretaries themselves, to which they were exposed if they boldly avowed their Catholic belief. Those very regulations which superficial observation would at first incline to pronounce puerile were intended to shield and save. The only

* In Dresden, the detection of similar sectaries was followed by their being obliged to emigrate to the United States of North America, where the Manichæan practices of their leader caused him, in 1839, to be brought to justice by his own adherents.

means to effect a reform among Manichees was to lift the veil from the secrecy of their criminality; and, therefore, avowal of crime, and humility in acknowledging error, gave to all grades of malefactors a title to mercy, and afforded a sure means of rescuing them from the penalties which would otherwise have been inflicted by the State. A distinctive penitential garb; enlisting in the crusades; solitary imprisonment; engaging those who had been heretics to preach Christianity; coercions which sundered them from corrupt associates; were well-adapted punishments, inflicted to preserve and not to destroy.

The Inquisition was the instrument by which the Manichæan heresy was speedily extirpated; but it was also, undeniably, the means of saving multitudes of heretics from the flames. Culprits were not delivered up to the temporal authorities, except in cases of contumacious persistence in depravity, and after delay and every artifice of persuasion had been vainly employed to convert them. The recognized punishment for heresy was burning; but the Inquisition never itself passed sentence of death, or imposed any retaliatory infliction upon offenders. It was, on the contrary, more strenuous in pursuing its vocation of mercy, because it existed in an age of unsparingly stringent laws, from whose severity it could not protect the criminal after he had once been sentenced.*

If no Ecclesiastical Court for the trial of heresy had ever been instituted, it is probable, if not certain, that before the commencement of the fourteenth century, Europe would have been rent in pieces by religious wars, and inundated with blood. As was before remarked, no protective or preventive police was then known, and the administration of justice was in the hands of a brutal soldiery, who often confounded the innocent with the guilty. When the Albigensian war began, the infuriated Catholic besiegers of the city of Béziers are said to have massacred 15,000, or, according to other accounts, 60,000 persons, without regard to age, sex, or creed.† The main-

* The Inquisition was peculiarly the means of preventing the innocent, thoughtless, and less hardened from suffering with the contumacious and stubbornly criminal. Limborch (*Hist. Inquis.*, 201, 228) admits the marked difference made by the Inquisitors between the Albigenses and the less criminal Waldenses. Yet Limborch himself exaggerates so malignantly that Gibbon remarks of his *Liber Sententiarum*:—"They deserved a more learned and critical editor. As we must not calumniate even Satan, or the Holy Office, I will observe that, of a list of criminals which fills nineteen folio pages, only fifteen men and four women were delivered to the secular arm."—*Decline and Fall*, c. liv.

† Sismondi, *Littérature du Midi*, t. i. p. 201.

VOL. VIII.—NO. XV. [*New Series.*]

tenance of Catholicity was a part of the policy of those Emperors who were the most hostile to the Court of Rome, and the most sanguinary edicts against the Manichæans were published by Frederic II., whose irreconcilable enmity to the Pope fills up the greater portion of the history of his reign.

The experience of a century had taught that the mere opposition to heresy of savage kings, and a half-barbarous nobility, less instigated by religion than self-interest and revenge, might lead to mutual butcheries, but would never weaken the power of their cunning and hypocritical adversaries. Every other means had been essayed to shake the corrupt influence of Manichæism before Rome introduced the Inquisition, and, unless there had been an innate, heaven-born, all-controlling power in the Church, unquestioned by Christians, respected by her adversaries, and superior to brute force, even this last effort would have failed. The institution of the Inquisition, by Gregory IX. and his successors, is one of the most glorious instances, among those that have constantly been witnessed in the history of Christ's Church on earth, of the interposition of the mercy of God to save from the severity of man.

The intervention of the Christian Church, in compelling the State to submit the criminality of heretics to her decision, before executing its own penal laws, was a grand and majestic display of the power inseparable from its infallible prerogatives, which saved Christianity and saved civilization. An obscene paganism, which had existed for a thousand years, threatened to overwhelm Europe in the rude age succeeding its rescue from barbarism and idolatry; and mankind will ever owe a debt of gratitude to the Inquisition, and to the successors of S. Peter by whom it was founded, through whose instrumentality, in so astonishingly short a time, this tremendous danger was encountered and overcome.

ART. IV.—DR. PUSEY ON ECCLESIASTICAL UNITY.

An Eirenicon. By E. B. PUSEY, D.D. Oxford: Parker.

The Anglican Theory of Union. By the Right Rev. Bishop ULLATHORNE.
London: Burns & Co.

Peace through the Truth. Essay the First: The Unity of the Church. By
Rev. T. HARPER, S.J. London: Longmans.

Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church. By T. W. ALLIES, M.A. London:
Longmans.

THE truth of Catholicism rests on historical arguments, which are not only incontrovertible, but in some sense irresistible. "The proof seems" to F. Newman "such as even to master and carry away the intellect directly it is stated; so that Catholicism is almost its own evidence."* We cannot of course tell into what particular shape F. Newman would throw the historical proof to which he refers; but for ourselves we should put the thing thus. The three following propositions seem to us so absolutely undeniable, that no one in his senses would have thought of calling them in question except for his dislike to the conclusion which they indicate. I. The Christian religion was identified in its first promulgation with a certain corporate society, which was preserved in unity by its members' belief that God commanded their obedience to one supreme central government; that of the Apostles. II. It was a fundamental doctrine of Christianity from the first, that this society should remain to the end of the world as the one authorized teacher of religion. III. No other corporate society in subsequent times either has been, or can be, suggested as the appointed continuation of this original society, excepting only the Church in communion with Rome. Assuming therefore that Christianity came from God, these propositions directly establish that none but a Roman Catholic can be said in any strict sense to accept that religion which Christ revealed.

Now innumerable objections have been raised against this conclusion; and that on every imaginable ground: on moral and spiritual grounds; on scriptural, philosophical, historical, political grounds; on grounds of secular science; on grounds

* Lectures on Catholicism in England, Preface, p. viii.

of common sense. But, extreme as such a statement must appear, we really believe that no one anti-Catholic, up to this very moment, has attempted directly to impugn any one of the three propositions above recited. On the contrary, the tactics of Protestant controversy have invariably been, on the one hand to accumulate argument and invective against Catholic *doctrine*; on the other hand to put (as far as might be) out of sight and out of memory the historical basis on which Catholicism itself reposes. And this very circumstance, of course, much encourages the faith of an educated Catholic. As to the assaults made on individual doctrines—from the very fact of being a Catholic, he perceives, as a matter of immediate experience, that the great majority of them are simply imbecile and worthless. When, *e.g.*, Dr. Pusey and others tell him, on *a priori* grounds, that his constant and unintermitting worship of Mary lessens his simple trust in Jesus, such a statement can only elicit from him amazement and pity; because he knows, as a matter most strictly within his own personal cognisance, that Marian devotion is among his most efficacious helps for growing in the knowledge and the love of God. Assaults indeed on the *historical evidence* of Catholicism might in some sense be far more intellectually formidable; but no such assaults are attempted.

It is the purpose of our present article to dwell on the three propositions which we began by reciting. It is exactly a year indeed since, on the first appearance of Dr. Pusey's *Eirenicon*, we went briefly over the same ground. But our then discussion was occupied with a large number of other matters also; and this particular argument therefore did not stand out in sufficiently strong relief. But in our next number we are to encounter Dr. Pusey on Papal Supremacy; and no one can do any kind of justice to the overwhelming body of proof which establishes that doctrine, unless he first places in a clear and full light the (logically) preliminary question of ecclesiastical unity. This subject has been, during the past year, powerfully handled by the other eminent writers whose works we have named at the head of our article. The Bishop of Birmingham's pamphlet is full, as might have been expected, of orthodox and weighty comment on Dr. Pusey's fallacies; several of which, and those among the most un-Catholic, had never been pointed out till the Bishop took them in hand. F. Harper's first Essay—though in our opinion decidedly less striking than the two latter*—yet is especially

* F. Harper, indeed, by his two last Essays, has raised up (so to speak) a standard of judgment against himself, by which his other compositions very

successful in its exhibition of the fantastic incongruities which are involved in any notion of the Anglican Church being Catholic. Moreover, he is a very *Cedipus* in solving the hardest riddle of our time; viz., Dr. Pusey's meaning in those odd utterances which he has put forth (pp. 45—66), concerning ecclesiastical unity. Mr. Allies has tried his hand at the same task; but has (we think) comparatively failed: it was reserved for F. Harper to find out what Dr. Pusey really intended. We are adding but small praise to this, when we say that F. Harper has succeeded to a marvel in *replying* to Dr. Pusey's statement; for the whole difficulty consisted, not in the reply, but in the preliminary interpretation. Lastly, Mr. Allies has written a work which, though in form a pamphlet, will remain (we are convinced) among the permanent treasures of English Catholic literature; and which is logically even more complete and unanswerable than that treatise on St. Peter's See which obtained the signal honour of being translated into Italian at the Holy Father's command. His pamphlet indeed is far more concerned with Papal Supremacy than with Ecclesiastical Unity; and it is in our next number that we shall make our chief use of it. But it contains a patristic catena on unity, which will be most serviceable to our purpose; and to which we shall draw attention before we conclude. Now then for our argument.

It will be found far more convenient to assume at starting the divine origin of Christianity. In other words, we assume that, at a certain period of the world, certain Apostles were commissioned by God to teach all nations a newly-revealed religion. Now, two different ways were imaginable (to mention no more) by which the doctrines of this new religion might have been imparted. They might have been imparted in the way adopted by some London lecturer to promulgate his favourite tenets. Supposing he has not published any book, those who wish to know his views come to hear him; or else pick them up from others who have been to hear him. So it is abstractedly imaginable, on the surface at least, that the Apostles simply communicated their doctrine to those who came; that these talked of it to others; and so that in greater or less degree believers learned it. On such an hypothesis, Christians would of course associate very much together, simply because men *always* like to associate with those of like principle with themselves: but for a man to be

unjustly suffer. There has been nothing like them for years—we had almost said for centuries—in English Catholic controversy, in their particular line; and that, moreover, a line which no other exceeds in importance.

a Christian, would not *imply* such association; it would only imply that he believed in the Apostles' mission, and laboured, as opportunity might serve, to acquire a knowledge of what they taught. We are not at all maintaining that *in fact* such a body of dogma as the Apostolic could be taught in any such way; on the contrary, we are convinced that it could not. We are only saying that on the surface such a method is imaginable.

But all the world knows that the Apostles proceeded by a way totally different from this. Catholics, in particular, point out that on all who accepted the new religion as true, a divine precept was imposed of uniting themselves to a certain corporate society, and of submitting themselves to the Apostles as to the divinely-appointed rulers of that society. We enlarged last January (pp. 200, 203) on the unparalleled efficacy of such a method, for enriching the mind of believers with a deep apprehension of dogmatic truth: here we are merely concerned with the fact itself. Now, there is no fact more certain than this in all history; and it is a fact admitted quite as fully by those who disbelieve, as by those who believe, the divine origin of Christianity. The former, indeed, do not of course think that God really *imposed* the precept of submission to the Apostles; but they quite admit that the Apostles *alleged* such a precept. It is really not more certain that Christianity ever came into the world at all, than that it came into the world as identified with a corporate society claiming divine authority; and that the first believers considered themselves obliged by God's command to obey one supreme government, the Apostolic.

But as it is not our immediate purpose to argue with unbelievers, we will assume the general truth of the New Testament history, and thus narrow the issue. Now it is testified in every line, whether of the Acts or the Epistles, that no Christian was permitted to remain (so to say) "unattached;" that he was required to unite himself with some local Church, and obey her laws. This is so transparent on the surface, that its evidence would only be obscured by any attempt to draw it out in detail. The point, therefore, on which we will insist is, that the Christian Society or Church, *as a whole*, was (as we expressed it last January) "hierarchically" one; *i. e.* that it was wrought by God into unity by being placed under one supreme government. There were twelve Apostles. It is readily imaginable that each Apostle should have been constituted by God a ruler over his own flock, with no dependence on any higher authority except God Himself. What we are here pointing out is, that such was

by no means the case. Christians were not divided into twelve hierarchical societies, united together indeed in bonds of strictest amity, but each independently governed by an Apostle: on the contrary, all Christians were aggregated into one sole hierarchical Society, governed by the Apostolic body as a whole. We are not inquiring in this article—we expressly reserve such inquiry for our next number—what was the *mutual relation* of the Apostles in their work of government.* For anything we say at present, our non-Catholic reader may suppose, if he will, that the decision rested on each occasion with a *majority* of the Apostles; so that seven should carry it against five: or he may suppose (what is certainly a far more reverent and probable hypothesis) that the Apostles were specially overruled in each particular case to issue harmonious commands, just as they were inspired to teach harmonious doctrine. We do but maintain that the Church of the Apostles, *as one whole*, was placed under the government of the Apostles, as of *one governing body*.

Now as to the earlier portion of the "Acts," no comment can possibly make this clearer than a simple perusal will make it. To say that in these chapters S. Peter is represented as supreme over one Christian society; S. John over another; S. James the Greater over a third; would not be simply false, but rather unmeaning and preposterous. The case of S. Paul is undoubtedly very different; and there is more than one fact recorded in Scripture, which is understood by some as implying that he felt himself at liberty on various occasions to act in opposition to the earlier Apostles. It is for this reason that we have devoted a separate article in this number to a consideration of his history; and we are fully convinced that no one can fairly give his mind to the case there exhibited, and entertain any doubt on the truth of our general conclusion. S. Paul never dreamed of teaching and governing a special Pauline Church of his own; but, on the contrary, he simply co-operated with the earlier Apostles in teaching and governing the Church Universal.

* "All we maintain then at present is this. There must be *some* central authority, *some* supreme source of jurisdiction, *some* court of ultimate appeal, *some* legislative and executive head—of whatever kind it may be—in the Church of Christ. And if legitimately established over her, it must be of Divine Institution. We do not define what it is. We do not say that it exists in a Pontiff, or in a Council of Patriarchs, or in an Œcumenical Council. But a headship of some sort there must be. For a human society cannot be truly one visible body, unless it have a central authority. And since Christ founded His own Church, and prescribed Its details, that authority must be of Divine Institution."—*F. Harper*, p. lxvii.

We may express the same truth by saying that, during the Apostolic period, all ecclesiastical jurisdiction (to use the modern term) came downwards from the general Apostolic body. SS. Barnabas and Paul, before their elevation to the Apostolate, possessed their authority at Antioch, because it had been delegated to them by S. Peter and the rest. SS. Timothy and Titus governed respectively the Churches of Ephesus and Crete, because such government had been committed to them by S. Paul, in exercise of a function recognized by all his brother Apostles as his.

The community did not make its rulers, but *the Apostles* made them; they and those they sent *formed the community and gave them overseers.*

The Apostles did not first make an agreement with their flocks, or receive rights from them, but stood over them with fatherly authority, as over their sons begotten in Christ. The very name of "Apostle" pointed back to One higher, whose messengers and ambassadors they were, so that whoever met a bearer of that title was compelled to ask or answer for himself the question, whose apostle this man was? The Twelve gave laws, as well conjointly, as at the Synod of Jerusalem, as separately, many of them not expressly ordained by Christ . . . S. Paul promised the Corinthians that he would make several regulations when he came to them. He knew how to exercise his power of punishing transgressors; the Corinthians themselves received Titus, whom he deputed, "with fear and trembling;" he threatens that he will come to them with a rod; he is ready to punish all disobedience, and will not spare when he comes; he bids the Thessalonians separate from those whose conduct is disorderly, and desires that the names of such persons may be given him. Where, as at Corinth, individuals or parties hesitated to recognize his authority, *this was from not holding him to be a true Apostle*: so that he simply maintained against them his claim to the Apostolic office, and *did not contend about the extent or rights of the office.*

Those really converted entered the Church to obey, and not to rule. Being told expressly that they were members of a body, they knew that it was a self-evident duty and necessity for them, as members, to obey the impulses emanating from the higher organs of the Ecclesiastical body.*

As our direct subject is Ecclesiastical Unity, it is important here to point out that, during Apostolic times at least, the preservation of corporate or hierarchical unity was (1), a precept divinely imposed on each Christian; and (2), an essential attribute of the Church. Let us put the imaginary case—in consideration of our motives, the Saint will forgive our insulting supposition—that S. Titus had summoned the Cretan Church to follow him into a state of separation from

* Döllinger's "First Age of Christianity," vol. ii. pp. 19, 98, and 26, of Oxenham's translation.

the Apostolic Society. Firstly, he and all his followers would have committed mortal sin; but secondly, they would also have rendered themselves external to the Visible Church. The Church consisted exclusively of a certain corporate hierarchical society; and those therefore who were external to that Society, were external to the Church.

One very principal reason contemplated by God in thus constituting the Church, was undoubtedly that on which we insisted last January; viz., the unspeakable assistance which the Apostles derived from ecclesiastical *discipline*, in their momentous and most arduous task of communicating *Christian Truth*. We are thus led to consider *the original extent of the Church's infallibility*. And as this consideration is indispensable towards appreciating Dr. Pusey's ecclesiastical position; so also, independently of Dr. Pusey altogether, the circumstances of this time render it extremely important that the matter should be clearly understood. For the purpose then of afterwards prosecuting more effectually the argument we have begun, we will digress for a few pages, that we may explain what are those circumstances to which we here refer. Catholics just now, it seems to us, are menaced both here and abroad with a doctrinal danger new and most formidable. Of course in every age, as there have been Catholics reckless of venial sin and desiring only to avoid mortal;—so also there have been Catholics, who were desirous indeed of remaining Catholics, but who cared extremely little to avoid any error which did not actually amount to heresy. Such men have doubtless often enough persuaded themselves, that the Church teaches nothing as strictly of *faith*, which she has not expressly *defined*; * and therefore have naturally said (as it were) off-hand, that the Church's infallibility is confined to her definitions of faith. But what strikes us as so alarming at present is, that such a mode of thinking is no longer confined to those whose interests are merely secular, and who have no care for the Church beyond desiring not actually to break with her; on the contrary it extends, we fear, to many who

* Pius IX.'s words in the Munich Brief should ever be most carefully remembered. "Even if there were question of that subjection *which is to be yielded by an act of Divine faith*, such subjection nevertheless ought not to have been limited to those things which have been defined by the express decrees of *Ecumenical Councils, or of Roman Pontiffs and this Apostolic See*, but extended to those things also which are delivered as divinely revealed by the ordinary magisterium of the whole Church dispersed throughout the world." In p. 214, F. Harper describes this latter class of truths as having been "*implicitly defined*;" but we are not quite sure that this is a happy expression.

are full of zeal in her service according to their own idea of the due means for its promotion. We may possibly much over-estimate the prevalence of these opinions: no one would be more keen than F. Harper to discern the malignity of such a poison; and yet he seems to entertain no apprehension.* But at all events there are so many signs of mischief, that it has become of great moment to exhibit, on every fit occasion, the extravagant falsehood and the extreme dangerousness of the proposition above recited. "The Church's infallibility," say these Catholics, is "confined to her *definitions of faith*; to those definitions which prescribe some tenet, not as *unsound* (for in such definitions the Church may be mistaken), but as actually *heretical*." Such a proposition would unquestionably have impressed Bossuet, no less violently than Bellarmine, as simply portentous; and certainly, it seems to us, the question between "Ultramontane" and "Gallican" shrinks into actual insignificance by comparison. In one point of view, even Dr. Pusey's theory is more intelligible and reasonable than that of these minimizing Catholics; for he simply denies that the Pope and Roman Catholic Episcopate have been exclusively entrusted by God with custody of the Apostolic Deposit. But put *these* men through a catechetical process, and let us see the result.

Do you deny that the Ecclesia Docens, the Pope and Roman Catholic Episcopate, is endowed with infallibility, for the very purpose of faithfully maintaining that Deposit of Faith with which she was entrusted? "On the contrary, we admit it as a dogma of Faith." Do you deny that there are various tenets, not theological only but philosophical and in some sense secular, which lead by necessary result to actual

* We infer this from two circumstances in particular. In p. 53, he says in effect that all "questions which are not of *faith* may" freely "be debated in" the Church's "schools." Of course if some tenet were condemned, not as heretical, but as unsound in some lower degree, he would not dream of including that tenet among "questions which may be debated." But we think he would not by accident have fallen into this little inaccuracy of expression, had he at all shared our misgiving on the spread of that error which we are opposing. Then, in p. lxxi, he says:—"Never was there a time, perhaps, in the Church's history when she was so internally strong, so full of life, so free from *dissensions*, as she is at present." Now, certainly, we have never heard that, even in Germany, any Catholic *bishop* has given the slightest countenance to the error on which we are commenting; and so far the Church's circumstances are very greatly happier, than when almost the whole French Episcopate contended against the Pope. But the error itself, whether it has or has not spread extensively among Catholics, stands on a very different ground from Gallicanism. The latter is a permitted (though, we are convinced, a most mistaken) opinion; but we must maintain that this error is theologically censurable and unsound—nay, fundamentally anti-Catholic.

heresy? "It is manifestly impossible to doubt this." Nay, do you deny that various tenets of the kind, even when not leading to heresy *by logical consequence*, yet are so intimately connected with heresy, that if they unhappily took root among Catholics heresy must be the inevitable result? "We do not see how this can be doubted, any more than the former." If the Ecclesia Docens then had no power to expel these errors from the mind of believers, she would have no power to guard securely the Deposit of Faith? "Apparently not." You admit then that she has power to expel these errors from the mind of believers? "We must necessarily admit it." But she cannot expel them from the mind of believers, unless she can decide for certain in the first instance what tenets *are* thus erroneous and unsound? "That is but common sense." Then she is *infallible*, not only in condemning tenets as heretical, but also in condemning them as theologically unsound? * "On the contrary, this is that Ultramontane pretension which all intelligent Catholics so indignantly repudiate." But why "Ultramontane"? What has it got to do with the point at issue between Bellarmine and Bossuet? "I have not sufficient patience with these tyrannical pretensions, even to examine their precise nature." †

The pronouncements, thus contemptuously treated, occupy no minor or subordinate place in ecclesiastical history. Look at the last three hundred years alone. The ecclesiastical decisions, belonging to this period, occupy far more than one-third of Denzinger's volume; and (as Dr. Murray truly observes) Denzinger has been very far from including them all. But among these, how many *definitions of faith* are to be found? We have before us an earlier edition of Denzinger issued before the recent Syllabus, or our case would be even stronger: but of all the decrees which his work contains from n. 881 to n. 1501—i. e. 620 decrees,—we doubt whether there are more than ten which brand any condemned tenet with the precise stigma of *heresy*. ‡ Now the minimizing Catholic not only refuses to accept these decrees as *infallible*; he disavows any obligation of accepting them with interior assent. He admits, indeed, sometimes in theory, that he is bound not to *write* or

* See Dr. Murray's most unanswerable argument: "*De Ecclesiâ*," d. xvii. n. 56-63.

† This answer was actually given in conversation.

‡ We do not include, of course, any tenet of Baius, Molinos, or Quesnel, because there is no *one* of these which has been condemned as heretical; though the Pope has ruled that *some* of them are so, without mentioning which.

speak publicly in favour of any tenet which they condemn : though we would rather leave others to decide how far he ordinarily takes any pains to fulfil even *this* obligation ; how far he habitually scruples at publicly advocating any tenet, condemned *e. g.* in the "*Mirari vos.*" What, then, is his especial boast ? what is the particular benefit which he considers himself to gain by his free-and-easy procedure ? He is at once ready with his answer—"intellectual independence" : and it is this very principle of "intellectual independence," which the argument of our present article requires us to examine with special care and attention.

We say then confidently, that independence of intellect, just like independence of will, is not man's healthy state, but his disease and calamity. Independence of will consists in setting at nought every law, human or divine, and following each momentary passion and inclination : this is depravity—this is misery. Your will is in a happy, healthy condition, precisely so far as it submits itself humbly and unreservedly to God's commands, and aims on each occasion at discerning and pursuing His preference. Undoubtedly subjection of the will to a *wicked* master would be bitter slavery ; though whether even that would be more bitter than simple independence, may perhaps be doubted. But the will's *perfection* consists, neither in independence, nor yet in subjection to tyranny (God forbid !) ; but in subjection to God, Who is Goodness. Just so as regards your intellect. Its perfection consists neither in independent judgment on the one hand, nor in subjugation to false oracles on the other hand ; but in absolute surrender to God, Who is Truth : in submission to His express voice, and in docility to His discoverable intimations. Not in "intellectual independence" but in "intellectual captivity" * is true intellectual liberty and perfection. Dr. Pusey draws attention to the very large number of pronouncements which Pius IX. alone has put out (p. 290). What can be more welcome than this fact to those who are firmly convinced of their infallibility ? Is not an increase of infallible truth greatly to be desired ? A true theologian, we must maintain, is ever desirous of obtaining the fullest possible light from ecclesiastical authority ; and throughout his investigations is ever gazing (if we may so speak) on the aspect and countenance of his mother the Church.

Now it is theoretically admitted by every Catholic, that the

* "*In captivitatem redigentes omnem intellectum in obsequium Christi,*"
 "αἰχμαλωτίζοντες πᾶν νόημα" (2 Cor. x. 5).

Church's infallibility has lineally descended (if we may so express ourselves) from Apostolic times. For the sake, therefore, of our controversy with minimizing Catholics, not less than for the sake of our controversy with Dr. Pusey, it is of extreme importance to consider *how far that infallibility originally extended*. Here, then, we are brought back to the very point at which we digressed; and on this issue we believe that there is really no room for difference of opinion.

1. We would draw attention to this fundamental and general principle, from which every particular truth on the subject is derived. The *extent* of her infallibility was precisely coincident with her *claim* of infallibility. How could any convert know that the Apostles were infallible *at all*, but by accepting their own statement concerning themselves? But their own statement concerning themselves included, not simply the fact of their infallibility but also its *extent*. No one could have any possible ground for believing the former, which would not, with quite equal cogency, induce him to believe the latter. This is really self-evident.

2. Then, secondly, the principle of "intellectual captivity" was admitted to its fullest extent. A Christian, on becoming such, was brought into contact more or less direct with certain personages, the Apostles, who claimed to be the organs of an indefinitely-extending Divine Revelation. From that moment, so to speak, his thoughts were not his own but another's; and he gloried in that circumstance, because of his firm conviction that that other spoke as the oracle of God. There is no charge of intellectual bondage and degradation brought by minimizers against more orthodox Catholics, which would not apply, in its full extent and in more than its full extent, to a highly educated Jew or heathen who should have been converted by S. Paul.

3. A large assemblage of devotional practices must have existed throughout the Church, either expressly approved or tacitly sanctioned and encouraged by some Apostle. It will be admitted by all who believe the divine origin of Christianity, that every doctrine implied in these various practices was infallibly true.

4. So also as to Apostolically-sanctioned methods of spiritual guidance and advice; of ecclesiastical discipline; ecclesiastical usage. Every doctrine involved in these was infallibly true.

5. Again, it will be admitted by all who believe the divine origin of Christianity, that an Apostle was not merely commissioned to teach his disciples the naked doctrine which he had received from God; but in every respect to guide them infallibly along the road to heaven. Suppose, then, a number of Stoics

and Epicureans had been converted to the Faith; but that they retained various portions of their old philosophy which, in the judgment of S. Paul or some other Apostle, led by necessary consequence to conclusions at variance with sound doctrine. In the exercise of his Apostolical office, he explains to them that these tenets are erroneous. We suppose no minimizing Catholic will deny—we are quite certain Dr. Pusey will not deny—that such warnings—and they must have occurred not unfrequently—would be infallibly just.

6. Or suppose, again, that some Apostle denounced—not any particular tenet—but this or that *book*; some book, *e.g.* written by a Judaizer or by an insufficiently converted heathen. The Apostle declares it to be imbued with unsound doctrine, and most dangerous to the unwary reader. Such a judgment as this comes most clearly within the sphere of his infallibility.

7. Or lastly, if various insufficiently converted heathen underrate the evils of some educational system, and are disposed to place their children under its influence, any Apostolic warning against such a system would be infallibly just.

It is not necessary to continue our recital further; we will conclude, therefore, with considering by way of contrast the minimizing theory. Let us imagine some one to maintain that the Church of the Apostles was only infallible, so far as regards her actual definitions of faith, solemnly and publicly put forth. It would follow from such a notion, that for about twelve years the Church possessed no infallible guidance whatever; and, moreover, that even at the end of that time, when a Council met, her one infallible verity was—not the Incarnation, or the Atonement, or the supernaturalness and efficacy of Grace—but the truth that Gentile converts were exempt from the Mosaic ritual! It is perfectly clear, then, that minimizers consider the Church to have lost, in post-Apostolic times, by far the larger portion of her infallibility: nay, they must admit that had she possessed no greater infallibility at first than they ascribe to her now, her children, for the highest practical purposes, would have then received no infallible guidance whatever. Such a conclusion is most amazing; yet we are prepared to weigh whatever evidence they may adduce in its support. But really, so far as we know, they have never even attempted to adduce any evidence whatever in behalf of so extravagant a paradox. They remind us of the well-known brief placed in a barrister's hands: "You have no case; scold at the plaintiff's attorney." We can obtain from them neither argument nor the attempt at argument; but only invective, declamation, and rhetoric. On

some future occasion we hope to develop more fully the course of reasoning here indicated. We should not now have entered on the matter at all, but for its close relation with our argument against Dr. Pusey; and as that argument must now exclusively occupy our attention, from our present article these minimizers henceforth disappear.

On the hypothesis, then, that Christianity is Divine, the following results ensue from our preceding remarks. When Christian preachers made a convert during the Apostolic period, it was involved in the very fact of his conversion, that he submitted himself to a certain corporate Society or Church: a Society which extended indefinitely over the *orbis terrarum*, but which was wrought into hierarchical unity by the precept of submission to one supreme authority. This Church possessed infallibility, not only in her formal, but also in her practical teaching. Her formal infallible teaching moreover was not confined to the condemnation of tenets directly contradictory to the Faith; on the contrary it extended on occasion to a condemnation of those which issue *by necessary consequence* in such contradiction. The convert, then, at once abandoned all private judgment, within that wide sphere which appertained to infallibility. He learned his religion by various acts of intellectual captivity: by humbly submitting his intellect to the doctrinal instruction given by the authorized superiors of his local Church; by regulating his interior life according to the rules and counsels placed before him; by joining heartily in the prevalent practices of devotion; in one word, by unreservedly surrendering himself to the new moral and spiritual atmosphere, which he had begun to breathe.* And his security against being led

* "It follows from the nature and design of the Church, that all its members are under a continuous educational influence. The Church is a moral power, holding together all its members in a real fellowship, even those not inwardly good, where on the whole the purifying and sanctifying influences are stronger than the indwelling evil in individuals. It is a great educational institution, not for one particular period of man's life, but for the whole of it: receiving him as a child, and constantly acting on him, cleansing, instructing, building up, and sanctifying through teaching, example, common prayer and worship, and means of grace; constantly nourishing and enlightening his mind, and seeking to strengthen his will, and only leaving him at his death, without even then regarding him as cut off, or renouncing its influence over him. In the Church, all are called: all, however sinful, are capable of salvation, and subjects of her educational action; all are intended, by taking and giving, to hold at once active and passive relations. All are to be prayed for, and to pray for others. All are to set an example to their fellow-members of the body, and to take example from them. None can sink so low that the Church need despair of him, or is not bound to stoop to him, and seek to lift him up again. While he lives, he is not given over, and the Church relies on the means of grace entrusted to her, which can fan into a bright flame the spark of light remaining, in spite of all sin, in the baptized, however near extinction."—*Döllinger*, vol. ii. pp. 27, 28.

astray in all this, was the gift of doctrinal infallibility which the Apostles had received, and by the light of which they directed their various local Churches. So far as the New Testament is concerned, men might not less probably allege that it points to Delphi or Dodona as to Christian oracles, than that it contemplates any other method of learning Christian doctrine except that which we have described.

Now the Catholic's contention is the most obvious and simple that can well be imagined. As Christianity entered the world in this particular shape, so (he maintains) it is to wear the same shape even to the end. Of course, this conclusion is not self-evident. It is most easily imaginable that God may have wrought changes in His own work; that during the progress of Christian history—for instance, at the death of the Apostles, He may have revolutionized the Rule of Faith. We only say that the onus probandi rests emphatically on those who may maintain that He *has* so acted. No one can doubt that God's work is to continue as it began, *unless* God has plainly proclaimed the contrary. The mass of Protestants say, "Go by Scripture;" well, it is to Scripture that we have appealed. Anglicans say, "Go by Scripture and Antiquity;" on this point at least the two are most unmistakably in unison. At present, however, we are speaking merely of Scripture. I study the New Testament, for the purpose of seeing and apprehending the lineaments of the Church of the Apostles; and behold there gradually rises up before me a fac-simile of the present Church in communion with Rome. If the one appointed way of learning Christian doctrine be *now*—as undoubtedly it was *at first*—docility to one infallible corporate society, you must all become Roman Catholics at once; for there is no other corporate society now on earth, which even *claims* infallibility. It is sometimes thoughtlessly said that the "Greek Church" claims infallibility; but no statement can be more undeniably unfounded. Ask any Russian why he believes any doctrine. Will he say because the Church in communion with the See of Moscow cannot err? or the Church in communion with some patriarch he will name? or some specified body of bishops? or the majority of them? He will give you his own *opinion* that his Church was right in her quarrel with Rome; but he will not say that she had any *promise* of being right. No. The very word "infallibility" suggests to every one's mind the further word "Rome."

Now to this argument a very ingenious answer may undoubtedly be made; and it will the more strengthen our case, if we proceed to treat that reply with the fullest justice and candour. It may be thus expressed: "You must your-

"selves admit that, when the Apostles died, things totally changed. You do not profess that Pius IX. is inspired as SS. Peter and Paul were inspired. When the Apostles died, then, things *could* not remain as they were; the Church's constitution *could* not remain unchanged. Roman Catholics themselves must admit that their Rule of Faith differs essentially from the Apostolic." In reply we must carefully consider a question, which on several grounds, indeed, is of much importance; viz., the precise sense in which you can say that the Apostles were "inspired." It is an undoubted fact that the Apostles were inspired, and that later Popes are not so in the same sense. We are here to consider whether this undoubted fact implies any real difference between the Apostolic and the Roman Catholic respective Rules of Faith. The view here to be taken is, we believe, precisely identical with that expressed or implied by all Catholic theologians. We shall only take the liberty of assuming Ultramontaniam as the genuine Roman Catholic doctrine, in order to avoid the intolerable tedium of always adding the Gallican qualification about "consent of the Episcopate." In every instance our Gallican readers can easily make this addition for themselves.

1. The writers of Scripture, as such, possessed a most important "inspiration" of their own, while writing; with the full nature and extent of which we are not here concerned. But this was possessed, not by the Apostles as such, but by Scripture-writers as such; it was possessed by SS. Mark and Luke no less than by SS. Matthew, John, and Paul. Moreover, it was not a permanent gift; it lasted only while they were actually engaged in the composition of inspired works. The fact, then, that several of the Apostles were also inspired writers of Scripture, does not constitute any difference between their office and Pius IX.'s as *infallible teachers of the Church*. When the New Testament books were successively written, the Apostles infallibly proposed them to the faithful as inspired; and Pius IX. now in like manner, according to Roman Catholics, infallibly proposes them to the faithful as inspired. So far you have a point, not of difference, but of agreement.

2. But further, can it be said that the Apostles were always "inspired" in their oral instructions? and that *this*, therefore, constitutes a vital difference between them and subsequent Popes? Let us consider. We suppose that they all held occasionally—many very frequently—catechetical classes, whether of young or old. Can it be maintained that every passing illustration which they used was infallibly apposite?

Nay, or that every little doctrinal statement they may have hurriedly put forth was infallibly true? We are not aware of this having ever been maintained; and it seems to us at variance with all probability. S. Peter began a line of conduct which, as we know by inspired authority, was calculated to act prejudicially on the advance of Gospel Truth (Gal. ii. 14).^{*} If the Holy Ghost permitted this, it seems quite gratuitous to assume that He would interfere to prevent every minor and unimportant inaccuracy of statement, on such occasions as we are now considering; whenever, *e.g.*, an Apostle has undertaken his subordinates' work of routine doctrinal instruction. There can be no question that his "infused knowledge," of which we are next to speak, would give a most singular and unapproachable value to his doctrinal positions; but there is no reason that we know of for considering them strictly infallible.

3. What is more commonly meant, we think, by Apostolic "inspiration," is the "infused knowledge" which they undoubtedly had as Apostles, and to which no post-Apostolic Pontiff has made the most distant approach. "The Holy Ghost shall remind you of *all things which I have ever said*" (John xiv. 26), and "*shall teach you all the Truth*" (xvi. 13). Such knowledge, it is manifest, is absolutely different in *kind* from that attainable by uninspired men. It is evident, however, that this was no *part* of their instructions to the Church, but merely an invaluable means towards their *giving* those instructions.

4. Another extremely important sense in which the Apostles were "inspired" is, that they were *conscious* of repeated communications from God; whereas to all S. Peter's successors, those particular workings of the Holy Ghost, which secure infallibility, have not been consciously distinguishable from the ordinary operations of nature and of grace. S. Paul not unfrequently refers to dialogues with Christ; and we think his general tone will give every reader the impression that such dialogues were familiar to him. Here, however, as in the preceding case, the difference between S. Peter and his successor does not turn directly on the question of *teaching*, but of *preparation* and *fitness* for teaching.

5. In coming nearer, then, to the exact issue, we inquire what precisely were those doctrinal instructions of an Apostle which were infallible. This infallibility extended, beyond question, to his "practical" no less than to his "formal" teaching; for no Christians will admit that any doctrinal

^{*} See our remarks in our earlier article, pp. 47-49.

error could be involved in his devotional and disciplinary enactments. Still his infallible doctrinal instructions, whether formal or practical, were those only which he put forth as an Apostle; which he put forth in the exercise of his Apostolic authority. Moreover, in the Christian Church there is no "acceptation of persons;" no doctrinal favouritism: whatever doctrine is infallibly revealed *at all*, is infallibly revealed *for the whole Church*. The Apostle may have originally addressed it to a local Church, or even to an individual; but he none the less delivered it in his capacity of *Universal Teacher*. Still, then, we have come to no point of difference between the Apostolic Rule of Faith as understood by all Christians, and the modern Roman Catholic Rule as understood by Roman Catholics: except, indeed, that in the former there were twelve Universal Teachers, and in the latter there is no more than one.

6. We arrive, then, finally at the real points of difference, according to Roman Catholic Theology, between the utterances of an Apostle and of a later Pope. Firstly, then, the former very often spoke under God's perceptible and consciously-recognized influence; as a simple mouth-piece, to deliver some definite message with which he had been entrusted: whereas no Pope since S. Peter has ever fulfilled this office. On the other hand, it is very far from being true that *all* Apostolic pronouncements *ex cathedrâ* were of this kind. It is quite impossible, *e. g.*, that S. Paul would have spoken as he does in 1 Cor. vii. 12, "*ego dico, non Dominus*,"—if he were at that moment simply delivering a definite message, which he had consciously derived from Divine communication. It happened very often, then, that an Apostle spoke—just as Gregory XVI. and Pius IX. have spoken since—pronouncing indeed *ex cathedrâ*, and well knowing his own infallibility in such pronouncements; but yet not speaking as the mere articulator of a Divinely-dictated message. Secondly, however, by the very fact of consciously receiving from time to time these direct communications from God, S. Peter and the rest possessed a prerogative, quite different in kind from any appertaining to subsequent Pontiffs; the prerogative of making additions in the strictest sense to Divine Revelation and the Apostolic Deposit. Since the Apostles' death—as all Catholics know well—the Church possesses no further power, than that of infallibly preserving, analyzing, systematizing, combining, developing, inferring from, the one Faith once given: but, so long as the Apostles lived, that one Faith was still *being* given. And, thirdly, the Apostolic utterances *ex cathedrâ* were immeasurably more frequent than those of a post-Apostolic

Pontiff. An Apostle was constantly expressing, in some official and infallible pronouncement, this or that portion of the Truth, taught him so fully and profoundly by the Holy Ghost. In these three particulars, we think, consists the difference between those instructions, on the one hand, which were given to the Church by an Apostle, and those, on the other hand, which (according to Roman Catholics) are given to the Church by a Pope. We are very far indeed from wishing to understate the immense extent of that difference; but our readers will at once see that it is nothing whatever to the objector's purpose. The mere fact that Apostolic inspiration ceased, does not tend ever so remotely to the conclusion, that God revolutionized, at the Apostles' death, the appointed method of Christian instruction. Our original proposition does but return with increased cogency, that the onus probandi lies emphatically on those who *allege* so momentous a Divine interposition.

At the same time, if any one chooses to think that the onus probandi does lie on Catholics, he is very welcome to do so. Whether or no it reasonably lies with us, we are thoroughly willing to assume it. For nowhere, externally to the region of pure mathematics, is a more overwhelming argument to be found than that which establishes the Catholic conclusion.

Once more, then, let us sum up, and that under distinct heads. What was the Church's constitution in Apostolic times? She was one corporate society. Hierarchical unity was one of her essential attributes; and that unity was secured by the precept of submission to the joint government of twelve supreme rulers. These rulers were infallible in their whole body of official teaching, whether formal or practical: and their utterances *ex cathedrâ* extended on occasion to the condemnation of tenets, which were not *directly* at variance with the Faith, but only indirectly and by way of consequence. What was the intellectual attitude of a really consistent and docile believer? The attitude of intellectual captivity. He regarded the Church as an educational institution, and he submitted his whole mind to her invigorating, elevating, transforming influence. He was prepared at her bidding to sacrifice any of his most cherished convictions, excepting those which she had already explicitly or implicitly approved; nor could he even guess how great might be the intellectual sacrifice which this demanded at his hands. What was the Objective Rule of Faith? * The voice of the living Church. What was the Subjective Rule of Faith? He learned the doctrines of his religion

* It need hardly be said that we speak throughout this article of the "*Regula proxima*," not the "*Regula remota*."

by submitting his intellect to the instructions which he received from her ministers; by conforming his conduct to the rules and maxims which they prescribed; by uniting himself with the spirit of her whole practical and devotional system; in one word, by surrendering himself to the moral and spiritual atmosphere with which she surrounded him.

It is absolutely certain,—we are confident Dr. Pusey himself will not think of questioning it,—that during the Apostolic period such respectively were (1) the Church's constitution, (2) the believer's intellectual attitude, and (3) the Rule of Faith. It is equally obvious that, according to approved Roman Catholic doctrine, Christianity has remained identical in all these particulars up to the present moment: and, further, that it will so remain until Christ's second coming. Moreover, a third proposition is equally undeniable with the former two: viz., that if you follow Dr. Pusey, you must consider some most vital and important change to have been divinely superinduced upon the original Christianity, at one or other intervening period. We are next to consider the character and extent of that change, which Dr. Pusey's theory supposes.

In studying Dr. Pusey's work with this object before us, the most wonderful fact we find is the following. Dr. Pusey cannot possibly be ignorant that his view *does* suppose God to have made some marvellous change, since the Apostolic period, in His Church's constitution: and yet he never once contemplates that fact, or looks it steadily in the face. Consequently we have to labour through a dreary succession of misty, obscure, confused sentences, in order to answer that most perplexing question, What on earth does Dr. Pusey mean? His prayer-book complains that, in the Breviary services, it was often a work of greater labour to *find out* the Scripture lesson, than to read it when it *had* been found out. In like manner, the chief labour of his Roman Catholic opponents has come to an end, when they have discovered what *are* his propositions. For a *reply* to those propositions, their clear and intelligible statement will often abundantly suffice. On no matter does this so forcibly hold, as on this particular question of Ecclesiastical Unity: and as an illustration of the extraordinary difficulty which he has imposed on his interpreters, we will cite two different passages by way of introduction. Thus (1) he quotes the following opinion from a Photian bishop of the seventeenth century:—

I hold the dispute about the supreme power of the Pope to be the principal cause of our divisions. This is the wall of division between the two Churches. The chief controversy I hold to be about the sovereignty of the

Pope. For this is at this time the great wall of separation which divides the two Churches. If all Christians were agreed on this chief point, viz., how the Church was to be governed, *whether by aristocratical rule as we think, or monarchical as the Latins think*, there would be very little trouble in agreeing about the rest (p. 63).

Dr. Pusey does not indeed expressly say that he agrees with this statement; his constant vagueness, indeed, is the very complaint which we make: but he quotes it with warm sympathy and without hinting any kind of dissent. According to this view, the Church remains to the present day entirely unchanged. She was aristocratically governed in Apostolic times, and is aristocratically governed still.* The Greek prelate seems further to have held that his own communion is one corporate society, aristocratically governed; and consequently that she is the one Catholic Church, lineally descended from that of the Apostles. As to Dr. Pusey, if he agrees with the authority cited by himself;—if he holds that the one Catholic Church is one corporate society, aristocratically governed;—he must exclude from that Church either (1) Romans and Photians; or (2) Romans and Anglicans; or (3) all three. Yet if there is one doctrine more than another characteristic of his work, it is that *none* of these are to be excluded; that the three societies *jointly* constitute the Catholic Church.

Here, then, is one extreme. He complacently inserts this Photian citation, as though he really held that the Church remains unchanged in constitution from the Apostolic period. In another place he goes to the opposite extreme; and implies that the very notion of the Church's remaining unchanged

* It appears to us, with much deference, that the phrase "aristocratic form of government" is not used with perfect accuracy by F. Harper in p. 45. He says it would be an "aristocratic" form "if each of the great patriarchates had had within itself the source of its own absolute rights and its court of ultimate appeal." The question is, of course, purely one of words; but this is eminently a question, on which the accurate use of words is peculiarly important. We would submit, then, to him, that on such an hypothesis the Church would not be under *any* supreme government, aristocratic or otherwise. It would consist of four independent societies, each monarchically governed. On the other hand, in the preceding page (44), he uses the word in what seems to us its true sense. "Those who maintain," he says, "that the Church's form of government is aristocratic, declare that it resides in an Ecumenical Council." And so, in the following admirable passage from p. lxiii:—"Whether He intended the Church's government to be aristocratic . . . ; or democratic . . . ; or monarchical . . . is not to our present purpose. He, at all events, arranged it in one or other of these three ways; and whichever He elected, that one we must stand by. It is, at all events, certain that He did not make His Church to consist of a *federation of bodies politic*."

is self-evidently false. "Another principle came in," he says (p. 148), in the discussions on the Immaculate Conception, which he represents as a self-evidently false principle. What is this self-evidently false principle? The following: "That the Church being incapable of erring, anything taught throughout the Church, although not defined by any authority, or representing anything beyond the opinion of the actual clergy, was necessarily true. In the old words, the '*quod ubique*' was to be, ipso facto, a test of the '*quod semper*.'"^{*} Now, most indubitably, in *Apostolic* times, "the Church being incapable of erring, anything taught throughout the Church," with full knowledge and approbation of the Church's rulers, "although not" publicly and formally "defined by any authority, or representing anything beyond the opinion of the actual clergy, was necessarily true." Dr. Pusey, therefore, treats as manifestly and self-evidently false the very supposition, that there *can* be a Church in the nineteenth century possessing equal privileges with that of the first.

But in seeking to discover Dr. Pusey's real mind, we must put aside either of these extreme views. It is impossible he can deliberately think,—either on the one hand that the Church has remained without any change in her constitution;—or else, on the other hand, that the very notion of her having so remained is self-evidently false. As yet, however, we are none the nearer to discovering, what is the *particular* change which he considers God to have made. In a careful study of his volume, however, we have lighted on one passage, which seems to have escaped the researches of F. Harper and Mr. Allies. And this passage may, perhaps, be accepted as the authentic key to that bewildering disquisition on Ecclesiastical Unity, which has so taxed the ingenuity of those distinguished writers. In the earlier post-Apostolic time, says Dr. Pusey, "the Church was connected and joined together by the cement of bishops *mutually cleaving to each other*; each bishop ordering and directing *his own proceedings*, having hereafter to give account of his intentions to the Lord" (p. 236).[†] Here, then, we do obtain an intelligible statement, with which we can fairly grapple. Moreover, it is the very doctrine which was put forth as S. Cyprian's twenty-five years ago, in the Oxford translation of that Father;[‡] and F. Harper (p. 45) further

^{*} F. Harper, in p. 390, has an admirable criticism on this complaint of Dr. Pusey's.

[†] The words are S. Cyprian's; and we shall presently, in the text, consider that Father's mind. It is plain, however, in what sense Dr. Pusey adopts them.

[‡] Pp. 150–152. For instance, "We [Anglicans] make schism and separa-

mentions, that it was declared by Dr. Pusey on occasion of the Gorham judgment. The theory may be thus expressed: "Every Catholic bishop derives his authority exclusively from God. It is his sacred duty vigilantly to guard faith and morals; to condemn and expel heresies; to instruct and guide his flock: but for his mode of performing these duties, he is responsible to God alone. Every diocese is one independent corporate society; and 'the Church Catholic' is a name to express the aggregation of those dioceses. *Diocesan* unity consists in subjection of the flock to the shepherd: but *the Church's* unity consists merely 'in the cement of bishops mutually cleaving together;' that is, in a state of amity and harmony between the various independent bishops. If laymen or presbyters separate from the communion of their bishop, they become ipso facto schismatics; but if a bishop separate himself from the communion of his brother bishops, he does *not* thereby become ipso facto schismatical. Such a bishop may very probably exhibit a most unchristian spirit; but he does not divide himself from the Church's unity and separate himself from Christ. The bishop is no more subjected by God to Patriarch or Council, than he is to Pope."

This theory, which Dr. Pusey persuades himself is S. Cyprian's, underlies the long and obscure disquisition in the *Eirenicon* (pp. 45—69), to which we have already referred, and which F. Harper most patiently and sagaciously analyses (pp. 54—58). We have no room for the analysis; but F. Harper sums it up in the following words. We insert, however, within brackets one or two particulars; which F. Harper includes, indeed, in his analysis, but omits in his final summary.

The *formal* unity of the Church is a supernatural and Divine work, with which the human will has nothing to do. It consists in the union of each believer with Christ the Head after a physical manner by the sacraments, but especially by the sacrament of His Body and Blood. This is *objective* unity. *Organic* unity consists in an invisible and mediate union with one another by reason of our physical union with Christ, whereby we all invisibly meet in Him. [*Hierarchical* unity consists in subjection of the faithful each to some Apostolically descended bishop. *Unity of faith* consists in the belief, with which God inspires Christians, of that one body of dogma which the Apostles taught. These four unities] are essential to, and together are sufficient for, the *formal* unity of the Church. [These unities Christians receive without agency of their own; though they have the power doubtless to *reject* any one of them: if they do so, they fall into schism.]

tion from Christ lie in opposing *our* bishop; they [Roman Catholics] in opposing the *Bishop of Rome*.

But certain duties arise from the possession of this gift, and a perfection results from the performance of these duties, which principally consist in the intercommunion of churches, and their unity of worship. These are fitting, greatly desirable, necessary to the complement of the Church's perfectness ; but not essential to Her unity. And these latter alone depend on our free will.—(F. Harper, pp. 57, 58.)

There are, of course, various inconsistencies here. For instance, how can Dr. Pusey think that a Wesleyan receives the blessing of episcopal government, without any agency of his own? Again, as F. Harper asks (p. 56), in what imaginable sense can it be said that God infuses into Christians one Faith? We have no intention, however, of dwelling on such blots as these: nor again shall we speak in detail on the innumerable extravagances and absurdities to which Dr. Pusey would be compelled, by any attempt at carrying such a theory into practice. We entered on this theme at some length a year ago (pp. 217—219): but for our present purpose it will be more effectual, we think, to fix our readers' attention exclusively on the particular argument which we are pursuing. We will proceed, therefore, to carry on that argument by one or two further remarks.

Before entering, however, on these, we will offer an incidental explanation. It may be thought by those who have read F. Harper's work, that there is an important difference of doctrine between him and ourselves. He has throughout represented unity of *faith* as the Church's primary unity, and (p. 17) as "the foundation of all the rest:" whereas, for ourselves, we have laid by far our principal stress on unity of government, and treated unity of faith as dependent thereon. The difference, however, is no more than that F. Harper is writing as a dogmatical teacher, and we only as controversialists. The controversialist aims either at directly convincing Protestants, or else at helping other Catholics to do so; and it certainly appears to us that the Church's *corporate* unity, in every age and from age to age, is a phenomenon which it will be far more impossible for Protestants to deny or ignore, than her unity of *faith*. But the dogmatic theologian so arranges his matter,—not as that Protestants may be the more effectually convinced,—but as that believers may the more truly learn that full doctrine which God has revealed. Were that our present purpose, we should undoubtedly assign to unity of faith an emphatic precedence over unity of government. But we should treat, as the parent unity of all, the unity which results from that vivifying presence of the Holy Ghost within the body of the Church, on which Archbishop Manning has at

various times so beautifully and forcibly spoken.* Our present task, however, is purely controversial, and to controversy we now return.

There can be no question, then, that Dr. Pusey's theory on the Church's constitution is precisely that which we drew out a page or two back, where we paraphrased S. Cyprian's words in the sense ascribed to them by Dr. Pusey. Now he does not expressly say,—but he cannot possibly deny, when attention is called to the circumstance,—that in his view a change, not less than *fundamental*, was wrought by God in that constitution, at some period intervening between S. John's death and S. Cyprian's episcopate. He considers S. Titus to have been no less truly bishop of Crete, than S. Cyprian was afterwards of Carthage, or than Dr. Hamilton is now of Salisbury. Yet he will admit that had S. Titus left the communion of the Apostles, he would ipso facto have fallen into schism; and that all the Cretan clerics and laymen would have been under the strictest obligation of renouncing his authority. But this is the very doctrine which he *rejects* in the case of S. Cyprian and of Dr. Hamilton. He considers, therefore, in effect, that the mutual relation of bishops is now essentially different from what it was under the Apostles: and since no such change can possibly take place except jure divino, God Himself must have wrought it. Nay, it is not too much to say that, according to Dr. Pusey, the Church founded by the Apostles was simply *overthrown* at some period after their death. For consider an illustration. France has remained "one and indivisible" under the Bourbons, the Republic, and the Empire. But suppose that, through some strange vicissitude of fortune, each one of the separate departments into which France is divided were placed under a supreme and independent government of its own. France would still remain as a "geographical expression;" but that *body politic*, which men call the kingdom of France, would be totally dissolved. In like manner, according to Dr. Pusey, that corporate society which the Apostles founded, after their death was dissolved and overthrown by God. The Church of the Apostles was appointed by God to be one hierarchical society; but the later Church was appointed by God to be a multitudinous assemblage of independent hierarchical societies. The original Church was overthrown, and the new organization substituted.

'So as to the Rule of Faith. The Objective Rule of Faith, now appointed by God, is considered by Dr. Pusey to consist of these elements: (1) the concurrent teaching of Anglican, Roman, and Photian bishops, so far as they do concur; (2) the

* See, for instance, "On the Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost," c. 1,

decrees of those Councils which he considers Ecumenical ; (3) as regards the vast sphere of doctrine which lies beyond this circle, Scripture, and (4) Antiquity. The Subjective Rule of Faith, according to him, no longer lies in that unreserved self-surrender, of which we have spoken more than once, to the formal and the practical teaching of ecclesiastical superiors ; to the spirit which animates that teaching ; to the Church's circumambient atmosphere. On the contrary, as regards far the larger portion of what he accounts the Catholic Church, he holds that nothing could well be more mischievous than such self-surrender ; that such a course would keep back Catholics from all clear apprehension of Divine objects ; and would make them next door to idolaters. His very summons, the very suggested ground of his Eirenicon, is the truly anti-Apostolic proposal, that Christians on both sides shall cling to the naked letter of their formularies, disregarding the traditional and authoritative interpretation thereof. The Subjective Rule of Faith, then, now appointed by God, according to him, involves an independent exercise of private judgment by each man for himself on the following questions :—(1) Who are those bishops throughout Christendom who may justly be considered orthodox and Catholic ? (2) What are those doctrines which these bishops concurrently testify ? (3) Which of the various past episcopal assemblages were truly Ecumenical Councils ? (4) What are their various decrees, and the precise force of those decrees ? (5) On the innumerable remaining questions what is the sense of Scripture and (6) of Antiquity ? Dr. Pusey would urge, of course, that an inquirer should *begin* with a certain prepossession in favour of the teaching which he has received ; but he must also urge, that no stable and firm *belief* can be reared, according to God's Law, on any foundation except the above. We are not here offering any other criticism on this extraordinary Rule of Faith ; we are only expressing what no reasonable man will doubt. Dr. Pusey, we say, virtually alleges, not simply that the Apostolic Rule of Faith has been importantly *changed* by God, but that it has been absolutely overthrown ; that the original Rule has been destroyed, and replaced by another differing from it in every particular.

Now, if we have really established the above two conclusions, our argumentative victory is secure ; for Dr. Pusey will not dream of maintaining, or of thinking, that the Church's constitution and the Rule of Faith have been actually *revolutionized* by God since the Apostles' death. Yet,—though it might seem that in replying to such a notion we are combating a shadow,—it will be worth while briefly to indicate the course of argu-

ment which most peremptorily refutes any such allegation. But what period must we understand Dr. Pusey as *assigning* to this revolution? There is *no* period, of course, to which it can be assigned with the slightest plausibility; but there is only one which can be named without absolute infatuation: viz., the death of the Apostles. Then further, will it be maintained that God made the change by a special intervention? that He made a second revelation, to repeal so much of the former? To say *this* again would be absolute infatuation. The only suggestion, then, against which it is possible to argue, may be thus expressed. "God originally appointed to the Church a certain constitution, and to the believer a certain Rule of Faith; but He appointed both as merely temporary provisions. They were to come to an end when the Apostles died; and were to be succeeded at that epoch by provisions fundamentally different."

Now, it would be a mere impertinence to enter on the solemn and laborious refutation of a theory which, as so stated, no human being will accept; we will but state very briefly the obvious reply. Except indeed so far as on this or that particular, some circumstance of the moment may call for greater detail.

We will begin with Apostolic times, and with the New Testament their record. The corporate society set up by the Apostles was called "Christ's Kingdom," and "Christ's Church." Our Lord before His Death proclaimed it to be at hand; after His Resurrection He commanded its establishment; and after his Ascension the Apostles obeyed that command. Not only there is not the slightest indication that its establishment was to be but temporary; the direct contrary is everywhere expressed or implied. His first command, "Euntes docete omnes gentes," was accompanied by the promise, "Ecce Ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem seculi." He was to be then with the teachers and rulers of His Kingdom to the end of the world. But He knew, of course, that the Apostles would not live for that period; it was with them, therefore, and *their successors in office*, that He promised His perpetual presence. Nay, if you confine His promise to those individuals whom He was addressing, you exclude S. Paul himself from the office of "teaching the Gentiles;" to say nothing of SS. Matthias and Barnabas. And in like manner He had promised that "the gates of hell should not prevail against His Church;" i.e., as every commentator explains, whether Protestant or Catholic, that his Church should never be destroyed, *while the world remains*. Nor was it called the *Apostles' kingdom*, but *Christ's kingdom*: they reigned as His

vicegerents. Does a reign generally terminate, because the king's *vicegerent* dies? Indeed S. Paul expressly says (1 Cor. xv. 25—28) that Christ is to reign until the very end. As S. Paul approached the termination of his course, he made provision for the continuation of that educational organisation *which existed*; and exhorted S. Timothy to train up future teachers of the Church (2 Tim. ii. 2). Shortly before, he had mentioned "the Church of the living God," as though to express her permanent life; and called her "the pillar and basis of the Truth." It is on the Church of the living God, then, and not on some new foundation, that the superstructure of Gospel Truth was in future times to rest.

In the same connection we may refer to F. Harper's most forcible exposition of Eph. iv. 11—16, from p. 8 to p. 16. For what purpose, according to S. Paul, did Christ constitute the Church? for a temporary purpose which was to last during the Apostles' life, and then to cease? No.

The Hierarchy then was established for this grand object, that the souls of men, having from age to age throughout the world been united in the unity of the one faith, the Visible Church or mystical Body of Christ *might grow to Her full stature or age*, as Christ grew in wisdom, grace,* and bodily perfection: that she might ever receive to Herself and assimilate men of all nations, temperaments, positions, and different education, and form them into one complete body,—one in itself, one in union with its Head, one in its faith, one in the intimate bond of that common charity, which animates and visibly joins in one all its members.—*F. Harper*, p. 11.

And F. Harper thus admirably sums up S. Paul's argument:—

To sum up, then, this detailed examination of the doctrine of the Apostle, it is indubitable that it embraces the following propositions:—

1. The Church is one body, animated by one soul.
2. It is a *living* body, with will and action proper to itself.
3. Its soul is the profession by all its members of the one Faith contained in the sacred and Apostolic deposit.
4. This unanimity of profession is its primary principle of unity.
5. This profession depends, so far as each member or particular church is concerned, on the free will of each, assisted, of course, by grace; and consequently we must be studiously "careful to keep the unity of the spirit." If we do not, we become heretics, "carried about with every wind of doctrine."
6. The Church, as a visible kingdom, has also a corporate unity.

* F. Harper has explained most clearly, in p. 332, that our Lord's "advancement in wisdom and grace *was apparent only and not real*." In one or two other passages, however, such as that cited above, he has laid himself open to misapprehension by omitting this explanation. We fear that, for the sake even of some Catholics, it is really needed.

7. This unity consists first of all, in an intimate cohesion of its many members and several portions with each other; and secondly, in an analogy of growth, by mutual communication, and combination of common action.

8. The principle of this corporate unity is charity.

9. It excludes every kind of schism, as its contradictory.

10. This unity depends too on the free will of each member or portion; for the Church is said to "edify or build *itself* up in charity."

11. The one great means or instrument appointed by God for the preservation and increase of the unity of faith and charity in the Church, is the Hierarchy, with its distinct and subordinate grades, which itself is perfectly joined in one, that it may minister to the oneness of the whole body.

12. The Church, protected by this twofold unity, is to persevere *till She arrives at Her full stature in the time of the consummation of all things* (p. 15).

From the Apostolic, we now pass to what may be called the transition period: we mean that which elapsed between the death of the other Apostles and that of S. John. And the argument, derived from the facts of this period, seems to us the one simply unanswerable proof of our proposition.

The Apostles certainly had no end more nearly at heart, than the future preservation of Christian dogma in its fulness and purity. It is further evident that there could be no security for such preservation, no safeguard against that doctrinal corruption which they regarded as among the gravest of calamities, unless Christians were trained to hold firmly the Divine Rule of Faith. Now, our imaginary opponent thinks that at their death the Divine Rule of Faith and the Church's constitution were to be fundamentally changed. Had this been really God's appointment, the Apostles must, of course, have been inspired accordingly. Had they been so inspired, it is most certain that, in their keen zeal for doctrinal purity, they would have inculcated this truth with earnestness and perseverance. No topic would have occupied a more prominent and more emphatic place in their teaching, than the Rule of Faith which was to be called into existence at their own death. They would have guarded with most jealous care against the danger, otherwise so inevitably imminent, of their disciples supposing that the existing Rule was to remain unchanged. On such a supposition, S. John—throughout those many years during which he survived the other Apostles—would have been universally recognized as the Church's last infallible teacher; and his death would have been the most startling epoch in Christian history, since the great day of Pentecost had passed. We do not see how any one can doubt that this is temperately and fairly argued: and it is hardly necessary to add how violently inconsistent are the actual facts with any such hypothesis. S. John's death, instead of being

the most critical event in history, passes almost "sub silentio." The supreme teaching of inspired men was succeeded by that of uninspired, in a natural and easy succession; no trace, even the most distant, can be found of any new Rule of Faith; and the Church of the second century occupied, as of right, the very same position with the Church of the first.*

Lastly, for post-Apostolic times. Certainly, if there is one fact more than another exhibited in every page of ecclesiastical history, it is the firm belief of Christians that the Apostolic office in some sense continues. "Successors of the Apostles" is the recognized name given by every one to the Catholic Episcopate.

Then consider that phrase, "the Catholic Church," universally prevalent from the days of S. Polycarp. The word "Church" would surely be an extraordinary word to express the amicable coalition of independent corporate societies; "one" Church still more extraordinary; one "Catholic" Church the most extraordinary of all.†

Passing to individual patristic passages, Mr. Allies has most serviceably given a catena of such from pp. 90 to 115. He begins with S. Clement of Rome, who was Pope before S. John's death; and he carries the series down uninterruptedly to the time of S. Augustine. He thus sums up his citations:—

As there is one only Christ, so there is one only Church; as the Church is one, because Christ is one, so it is *one Body*, because He has taken a Body: it is therefore the work of His Incarnation, and *to dissolve this Body is to dissolve Christ*; for as Christ cannot be divided, so neither the Church; the Church, as his Body, is the receptacle of His truth and grace. As the Holy Spirit dwelt in Christ upon earth, so He dwells in the permanent order of the Church's ministry, *the perpetual existence of which, in the unity of His Body, is the safeguard against error*. Through this ministry, as the joints and ligaments of this one Body, the life of Christ descends from the Head to the members, and Christ's life is Truth and Grace. Thus *the Holy Ghost dwells in the Church permanently*, as in a home, as in a shrine, as in the Body of Christ, as the marriage-ring with which she is espoused as His Bride: but the same Spirit dwells in particular men *only as members of the Body, and so long as they continue to be members of it*; as dwellers in the House, and so long as they continue to dwell in it; as worshippers in the Shrine, and so long as they continue to worship in it. By virtue of this union with Christ, as of the Body with the Head, the Church possesses *the great function of receiving, teaching, unfolding, and preserving the Truth*, and of communicating the Grace by which the Truth is held; and the mode of this union is the in-

* The preceding paragraph and another, occurring later, are reprinted from our article of last January.

† The Bishop of Birmingham very cogently refers to this expression. pp. 14, 15.

dwelling of the Holy Ghost in her, as the Spirit of the Head. Thus, belief in our Lord and His Incarnation is blent and fused throughout with belief in the unity, truth, grace, stability of the Church : the Head and the Body stand together (pp. 118, 119).

It cannot possibly then be questioned, that the Fathers unanimously proclaimed visible unity as an inalienable attribute of the Church. And for a merely controversial purpose against Anglicans, this is enough ; for neither Dr. Pusey nor any other Anglican can allege that on *their* theory visible unity remains.

But further : there can be no doubt that "visible unity" involves what we have called corporate or hierarchical unity. Dr. Pusey, indeed, considers that visible unity remained in the time of S. Cyprian ; when nevertheless (according to his own interpretation of S. Cyprian's words) no bishop in Christendom was subject to any superior ecclesiastical authority. But now take the case of a local Church : the Church of Carthage, *e. g.* in the time of this very S. Cyprian. Let us suppose that all the presbyters agreed with each other in doctrine ; but that in matters of discipline, worship, education, &c., no presbyter were subject to any higher earthly authority. Each one is busy in promoting his own schemes for the spiritual welfare of his parish. Each one declares that no one on earth has a right to interfere with him ; that he will introduce whatever devotional practice he pleases ; whatever discipline he pleases ; inflict what penance he pleases ; excommunicate whom he pleases. Would Dr. Pusey mention "visible unity" as the characteristic of such a Church ? Or would he not rather call loudly for Episcopal discipline, in order to remedy the confusion, bewilderment, discord, tyranny, misery, loss of souls, which must thence result ? If, then, it would be madness to say that a local Church can possess *visible unity* without *submission to one supreme government*, how can it be considered reasonable so to dream concerning the Church Universal ?

But the absolutely decisive consideration is this. Post-Apostolic Catholics had the Books of the New Testament before them ; and on the very surface of the New Testament they discovered, that the Church's original unity was a corporate, hierarchical, unity. According to Dr. Pusey, they were well aware that all this was now changed ; that God, instead of *enjoining* on bishops *subjection* to one supreme authority, now only *exhorted* them to *mutual concord* ; that the *precept* of corporate unity was superseded by a mere *counsel* of *affective* unity. On such an hypothesis, it is plain that whenever the Fathers spoke of ecclesiastical unity, they would dwell earnestly, and perhaps regretfully, on the contrast between Apostolic and post-Apostolic times. The one thing which could not by possibility

have happened, is precisely that which in fact did happen : viz., that they exhausted every imaginable phrase and simile to express the perfection of the Church's unity, without throwing out the slightest hint that such unity was inferior in *kind* to that enjoyed by the first Christians.

If we ask Dr. Pusey what single patristic testimony he can allege for the Church's constitution having been thus revolutionized, he will of course deny that it *has* been revolutionized. And yet even Dr. Pusey cannot deny that the Church's original unity was corporate and hierarchical. We will change, then, the form of our question : we will ask him what testimony he can allege for his opinion, that the Fathers did not regard corporate unity as strictly essential to the Church? The whole number of his patristic quotations is exactly four. Three of these have been encountered by F. Harper (pp. 68—71); and the marvel is what can have induced Dr. Pusey to allege such wildly irrelevant fragments. The fourth is that passage of S. Cyprian's, which we quoted above, and which seems to have escaped F. Harper's observation. Now it so happens, that a very few years earlier S. Cyprian had expressed formally and in detail his doctrine on "the Unity of the Church;" and Dr. Pusey should surely have referred to that work, if he wished rightly to understand the meaning of S. Cyprian's later words. To prevent any possible charge of unfair quotation, we will take that treatise precisely as it stands in the Oxford translation.

In all controversy we never heard of a more amazing subterfuge, than the old Tractarian statement, that S. Cyprian in this treatise describes the unity, not of the Church *Catholic*, but of the Church *local* : *i. e.* of the individual diocese. We know not whether Dr. Pusey retains this view; but it will be more satisfactory not to omit its refutation. S. Cyprian begins his whole argument by mentioning Christ's commission to S. Peter, "Feed my sheep;" and by the undoubted fact (p. 134), that "He built His Church upon Peter, being one." Are *Christ's sheep* merely the *Catholics of one diocese*? Is "the Church" which Christ expressly promised "to build upon" Peter,—the *local*, or is it not the *Catholic Church*? S. Cyprian proceeds to say (*ibid.*) that "the Episcopate is one and undivided": he is not speaking therefore, you see, only of presbyters being united to their bishops; but of bishops being united with each other. "The Church," he proceeds, "is one, though she be spread abroad, and multiplies with the increase of her progeny." Is the local Church then "spread abroad"? All this occurs at the very outset of his argument: and it would be really impertinent to say more against a theory,

of which one must unfeignedly wonder that grave and sincere men can have embraced it.

Secondly, S. Cyprian speaks of a certain visible unity as existing throughout the Catholic Church ; an unity which is so indispensably prescribed by God, that no one external to it can be saved. No controversialist, who admits that he is speaking of the Catholic Church at all, has ever doubted that this is his statement concerning her constitution. We will therefore briefly refer to a few such sentences as these :—"He who breaks the peace and concord of Christ, sets himself against Christ" (p. 135) ; "he who holds not this unity, . . . holds not the truth *unto salvation*" (ib.). "Who is the criminal and traitor . . . as to think *ought can rend . . . God's unity*, the Lord's garment, Christ's Church?" (p. 136).

But now, thirdly,—and this is the critical question—of what nature is this visible unity? No one who reads the treatise carefully can give any answer except one ; but there is one passage in particular, which expresses it beyond the possibility of misconception. In p. 136 he compares the Church's indivisible unity to our Lord's "inviolable and individual robe," which was received "once for all *and indivisibly* as one *unbroken whole*." Then he thus proceeds :—

On the other hand, when, on Solomon's death, his kingdom and people were split in parts, Ahijah the Prophet, meeting King Jeroboam in the field, rent his garment into twelve pieces saying, "Take thee ten pieces ; for thus saith the Lord, Behold I will rend the kingdom out of the hand of Solomon, and will give ten tribes to thee ; and two tribes shall be to him for My servant David's sake, and for Jerusalem, the city which I have chosen, to place My Name there." *When the twelve tribes of Israel were torn asunder*, the Prophet Ahijah *rent his garment*. But because *Christ's people cannot be rent*, His coat, woven and conjoined throughout, was not divided by those it fell to. Individual, conjoined, coentwined, it shows the coherent concord of our people who put on Christ. In the sacrament and sign of His garment, He has declared the unity of His Church.

Christ's robe, then, *undivided* represents the Church's *unity* ; Ahijah's garment *rent*, represents *schism*. What then, we ask, was that event in Jewish history, which S. Cyprian cites as his parallel to ecclesiastical schism? *The division of that corporate society* which had hitherto existed entire. By the Church's unity, then, S. Cyprian most undoubtedly understands her corporate, hierarchical unity ; her unity under that divinely appointed supreme government, which is parallel to the divinely appointed government of Salomon.

Then, finally, it was a manifest fact before S. Cyprian's eyes, whenever he opened any book of the New Testament, that

the Church's original unity was corporate and hierarchical. But his whole argument is built from first to last on the assumption, that that unity which she first possessed was ever to remain her essential attribute.

It happened, however, a very few years afterwards, that the writer of this treatise on the Unity of the Church, came into conflict with Pope S. Stephen; and in the course of that conflict used the words quoted by Dr. Pusey, about "each bishop ordering and directing *his own* proceedings, having hereafter to give account of his intentions to *the Lord*." Now it is evidently impossible for us to enter into the history of this conflict, until we arrive at the question of Papal supremacy: we will therefore assume, for argument's sake, what is most certainly not true, that the words mean what Dr. Pusey supposes.* We cannot directly expose the complete irrelevance of Dr. Pusey's citation, without irreverence to so glorious a servant of God as S. Cyprian: we will therefore suppose that the then Bishop of Carthage, instead of being a saint, was a very ordinary, every-day person. His history, according to Dr. Pusey, ran thus:—He was led at one time to consider the Church's traditional doctrine on her own unity: and he carefully explained to his flock that this unity is corporate and hierarchical; that no one, bishop or other, external to this unity, could be saved. Soon afterwards he took up a most serious doctrinal error, concerning the Baptism administered by heretics and schismatics. On being corrected by the Pope for this error, he warmly resisted Papal authority; and (incredible as it must appear) went the length of saying that no bishop was accountable to any authority on earth for his ecclesiastical acts. Here is a proposition directly contradictory to the theory, which he had so recently laid down as traditional and Apostolic. Either, therefore, his testimony must be waived altogether—it must be rejected as worth nothing on either side—or else a comparison must be made between the respective occasion of these two dicta. When he put forth the former, he was contending for a cause (resistance to Felicissimus and Novatian) which Dr. Pusey holds as Catholic and orthodox; when he put forth the latter, he did it in order the more freely to advocate what Dr. Pusey himself considers a most serious doctrinal error. "See, then," one would naturally say, "the result of doctrinal error! his unhappy mistake about Baptism has led him into an even more unhappy mistake about Ecclesiastical Unity."

* The "*Études Religieuses*" of last August carefully examined S. Cyprian's words (see particularly p. 492), with particular reference to Dr. Pusey.

Let us again explain ourselves, to avoid all possibility of misconception. S. Cyprian is a great saint; and his words have no such sense as Dr. Pusey supposes. We have but argued that even if they had such a sense, they would in no way advance Dr. Pusey's cause. What they really do mean, we are to consider in our next number, when we examine his whole conflict with S. Stephen.

Finally, let it never be forgotten that at last the real question most undoubtedly is, whether or no the Church's constitution was *revolutionized* by God at some period after the Apostles' death. And in favour of *this* conclusion, Dr. Pusey not only does not dream of alleging any one patristic testimony; but he does not dream of even expressing his own individual opinion.

Our argument, then, on the whole is this. The Apostolic Church was constituted by Christ as one corporate and hierarchical society: claiming to teach with infallible authority the truths committed by Him to her charge; and inculcating them on all her members, through her various living organs and representatives. Moreover, the Apostles' death was not, by God's appointment, to make any change whatever in her organization. On the contrary, Christ and his Apostles had expressly declared that she was to remain on earth until His second coming. Correlatively with this broad fact on the one hand, there stands forth in history a broad fact on the other hand. From that time to the present, there has always been one, and (speaking generally) there has never been more than one society, precisely answering to the description which we have given.* This society, therefore, in every age has been the One Catholic Apostolic Church. There have been rare and exceptional periods, we admit—specially the period of that schism which terminated at the Council of Constance—when there were two rival claimants of Apostolic privilege. But the fact that at rare intervals there have been rival claims, does not tend ever so remotely to cause doubt in ordinary times, when there is no such rivalry. The Apostolic Church, such as we have described it, was to last till the end of the world. In the time of S. Irenæus there was one, and one only, such society. In the time of Constantine there was one, and one only, such society. In the time of S. Gregory—in the Middle Ages—at the time of the Reformation—there was one, and one only, such society. At the present moment there is one, and one only, such society. Hence she is the One Catholic

* On the "Greek Church," see p. 96.

Apostolic Church : and her teaching, whatever it may be, is infallibly true ; simply because it *is* her teaching.

We have already said that, on the hypothesis of Christianity coming from God, we know of no argumentative chain, external to the region of pure mathematics, more irrefragable than this. Let us sum it up in four propositions :—(1) Christ entrusted His religion to the care of one corporate society as its infallible expositor. (2) He declared that this corporate society should last to the end of the world. (3) In every age, therefore, one corporate society exists which is thus infallible. (4) But there is no existing corporate society of which any one even alleges that it is thus infallible, except the Church in communion with Rome. Consequently, no one who is not a Roman Catholic belongs to that Visible Church which Christ founded ; nor accepts in any strict sense the religion which He taught.

We have avoided throughout all comment on the incredible extravagance of the Anglican theory, because we have wished to fix our readers' attention on our central argument. But now, that we have completed this argument, we would earnestly recommend to the notice of Dr. Pusey and other Anglicans, Mr. Allies's most eloquent and effective exposition of their ecclesiastical attitude. For ourselves, we have a most kindly feeling towards Dr. Pusey, and do not therefore entirely sympathize with Mr. Allies's *tone* ; but we really cannot wonder, with the Eirenicon before us, that many other Catholics judge him far more severely than we do.

Dr. Pusey (says Mr. Allies) with determined blindness to all the parties which internally distract his community (*the only connection of which with each other lies in that civil supremacy which he ignores*), takes up, from the beginning to the end of his book, a position which is ridiculous to those who know the real condition of that community ; for, with his singular views, he, being *frustum de frusto*, assumes to represent the whole *frustum*, self-commissioned as he is in this very representation, while he is really speaking at the utmost for one-tenth part of a dissolving heresy, which in its single bosom contains more contradictions than Donatists, Nestorians, and Monophysites put together, and is in truth the self-acknowledged, often the proudly-vindicated, domain of individual self-will and individual opinion, and represents the theological varieties of the English mind, as the daily press its political parties ; and so is called the *National Church*, as embracing the multitudinous heresies of the nation, and giving to each their respective influence, while it links them all together in a civil unity.

And thus, again, a particular interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles, which was presented some twenty-five years ago by its author only as one of several allowable varieties, yet even so was rejected by the vast majority of Bishops, clergy, and people as not within the range of permission, Dr. Pusey

now borrows from that author, disowning it, and produces as the proper interpretation of the whole community; and by the aid of this subterfuge, as if it was a true picture of the life of this community during the three hundred years of its existence, confers "a truth and office" upon what he calls the English Church, being *his conception not of what it is, or even of what it ever was, but of what it ought to be*. This conception, then, of something which should be, *but is not and has never been*, is presented by him on one side over against a caricature of the Catholic Church on the other; and this insult to truth, on the one side and on the other, he terms an *Eirenicon*, while it is constructed as a scarecrow to frighten troubled consciences from seeking their true home.

ART. V.—JOAN OF ARC AND HER MISSION.

1. *Historical Memoir of Joan of Arc, the Maid of Orleans*. Compiled from authentic sources. Boston: Patrick O'Donahoe.
2. *Joan of Arc*. (Article in the *Atlantis*, July, 1858, by Professor O'Hagan.)
3. *Panegyrique de Jeanne d'Arc*, prononcée dans la Cathédrale d'Orléans, à la fête du 8 mai, 1857, par Mgr. Gillis, Évêque de Limyra, Vicaire-Apostolique d'Edinbourg.
4. *The Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World, from Marathon to Waterloo*. By E. S. Creasy, M.A., Professor of Ancient and Modern History in University College, London.

THE memoir of Joan of Arc which stands at the head of this article is simply a translation of the work of Guido Görres, to the existence of which, however, strange to say, no allusion whatever is made by the publisher. We gladly welcome the reproduction in our own language of the only panegyric and the only vindication worthy (to use Professor Creasy's words) "of the truest heroine the world has ever seen," *i. e.*, a simple and truthful relation of her history.

Ours is an age of vindications and *rehabilitations*, and many of us have learnt to reverse the judgments of our youth upon names long buried in the dust of misconstruction and misrepresentation. Mary Stuart is recognized as altogether a martyr, and Mary Tudor as almost a saint, by many who had been brought up in the unquestioning belief of the veracity of Foxe's "Book of Martyrs," and of the genuineness of the forgeries of Cecil and Moray. The materials for the vindication of the fair fame of the Maid of Orleans are both full, and now easily accessible. "Her trial," says Professor O'Hagan, in his striking article in the *Atlantis* of July, 1858, "lasted, in all, four

months. Unjust in substance, it was conducted with scrupulous adherence to form. She was interrogated repeatedly and minutely as to the particulars of her life, and especially as to her supernatural claims. The interrogatories and her answers, taken down in French by the notaries on the spot, were turned into Latin, and embodied in the formal record of the trial drawn up shortly after its termination. Several exemplifications of this record, under the hands and seals of the notaries and the seal of the Bishop of Beauvais, her judge, are in existence. A copy also exists of a great portion of the original minutes of the questions and answers, in French, quite sufficient to testify to the general fidelity of the Latin version. Twenty years after her death the tardy justice of King Charles VII. caused him to solicit from Pope Calixtus III. the institution of a process for the revision and reversal of the sentence passed at Rouen. After an examination of the record of the former trial by the Auditor of the Rota, and his report upon it (a paper of singular ability), the Pope issued his brief for the process of revision; and, after a long investigation, the former sentence was annulled, and her good name fully restored. On this second trial were examined no fewer than 132 witnesses, including her uncle, Durand Laxart, who had been her first confidant, her other surviving relatives, her godfather and godmother—friends who had known her from childhood until she set out upon her journey to seek the king—her attendants upon that journey, the Duke of Alençon, Count Dunois, and others, her fellows in arms, her own chaplain, squire, and page; lastly, several of the assessors who sat upon her trial at Rouen, the chief notary by whom her answers were recorded, the friar who attended her on the scaffold, and many others present at her death. These depositions, embodied in the record of the second trial, exist in full. In addition to all this, there remain contemporary accounts of her in considerable number, some of them letters written from the camp almost in the light of her presence. Surely there are few historic personages of an epoch a little removed from our own whom there are materials of judging so abundant and trustworthy.

"Strange to say, with all these means of truth, the memory of Joan of Arc early passed into, and long remained in, the twilight region of uncertainty and fable.

"Almost in her own day the Burgundian chronicler, Monstrelet, gave that ungracious and sceptical account of her, filled with the idle inventions of her enemies, which was followed by writer after writer, till it became doubtful what she was—a heroine or a political tool—a fanatic or a cheat—

or that mixture of both which is such a favourite character with the philosophic historian."

The records of both the trials have been printed in full by Monsieur Quicheret, who has also collected every notice of Joan of Arc to be found in the writings of her contemporaries or of the age immediately succeeding her. The picture thus presented to us stands in striking contrast with that drawn by poets, or extant in histories more fictitious than poetry, in which the pure and pious village maiden, whose like, perchance, may still be found in some French or Belgian village, some cottage in Lancashire, or cabin in Connemara, has been transformed, according to the sympathies of the writer, into Shakespeare's fell sorceress, selling her soul and body to the Evil One for revenge upon the English; Schiller's iron-hearted Amazon, softened only by a touch of human passion; or Southey's Chartist heroine, who worships the God of nature in the woods rather than bow her free spirit before the altars of the Church.

"Most of the biographers of Joan of Arc," says M. Quicheret,* "have dated the overwhelming misery under which France lay crushed at the time of her appearance as its deliverer, from the murder of the Duke of Orleans in 1407: this is to look too far, or not far enough."

The late lamented Bishop Gillis, who quotes these words in his notes to his *Panegyrique de Jeanne d'Arc*, refers us to the reign of Philip the Fair, the coiner of false money, the oppressor of his people, the forsworn rebel against the authority of holy Church in the person of her head, for the crimes which paved the way for the great western schism, consequent upon the long residence of the Sovereign Pontiffs at Avignon, which was the result of his policy, and for the unutterable miseries entailed on France by the civil wars in the distracted reign of Charles VI., and by the victories of the English. It was not long after he had laid his sacrilegious hand upon the person of Boniface VIII. that the vengeance of Heaven fell upon his house. In the tide of his prosperity, having succeeded in all his enterprises, he was killed from a fall from his horse before he had completed his forty-sixth year, and fourteen years afterwards the last of his three sons, who had all resembled him in strength and personal beauty, followed the two others childless to the grave, and the son of Charles of Valois, the friend and captain of Boniface VIII., ascended the throne of France, which was to be filled by his descendants for more than two centuries to come. "Philip the Fair," says Rohrbacher, "disappears with

* *Aperçus nouveaux sur l'Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc*, pp. 13, 14.

all his posterity, and France, instead of expiating, fills up the measure of her monarch's iniquity, and is given up into the hands of the English, and on the point of becoming a province of England, when God sends a maiden from the Marches of Lorraine to restore it to the French.* The sons of Philip the Fair had quickly followed him to the grave, but he left a daughter behind him who brought a death of torture to her unhappy husband (Edward II. of England), and a heritage of blood and tears to the countries of her birth and her adoption. It was as the son of this Isabella, the *she-wolf of France*, that Edward III. preferred his claim to the throne of that country against that of the princes of the house of Valois, who rested theirs upon the Salic law, which barred the right of all descendants in the female line. Brilliant and glorious as a passage of arms in some romance of chivalry, the victories of Cressy and Poitiers had left no deeper impression upon the land which they had humbled, but failed to subdue. When the Black Prince sank into his premature grave, just one year before his once glorious father closed his sad and desolate career, owing to the wise policy of Charles V., and the good battle-axe of his valiant Constable du Guesclin, the only places of importance still remaining to the English in France were Bordeaux, Brest, and Calais. The sins of the nation and the selfish and unnatural factions of its rulers brought upon it the second and more terrible infliction of foreign invasion, from which the Maiden of Orleans was commissioned to deliver it. Of all the records of civil strife which pollute the page of history, perhaps none has so few redeeming features as that of the war between the rival houses of Burgundy and Orleans, in the miserable reign of Charles VI. The assassination of two princes of the blood by kinsmen and brothers-at-arms, brands it with the curse of Cain, while every feeling of honour and patriotism seems to have been lost in the frantic ambition and headlong revenge which urged each party in turn to invoke the aid of England. The state of the wretched inhabitants is thus described by Guido Görres, who faithfully follows the historians of the time:—

Murder, pillage, and incendiarism laid waste the kingdom, which was given up to robbers and assassins of every kind—English, French, Burgundians—soldiers, adventurers, townspeople, peasants. The fields lay fallow; whole populations emigrated; the fortresses and castles alone offered some chance of safety; the animals themselves became so accustomed to this state of things that, when the flocks heard the sound of the alarm-bell, they rushed of their own accord towards the gates of the towns.

* *Histoire Universelle de l'Église Catholique*, livre 78.

It was Paris, however, which presented the most deplorable appearance. The people suffered dreadfully from hunger and cold, through winters that were more than usually severe ; the poor were reduced to eat what the pigs rejected ; day and night women and children wandered about the streets, crying : *I am dying of want ! I am dying of cold !* Deserted children lay stretched by tens or twenties upon the dunghills, starved and frozen. Wolves came in troops into the cemeteries, and devoured the dead bodies even in the streets. But all this fell short of the horrors committed by a soldiery reduced to the state of savages ; imagination shrinks from such monstrous deeds, and trembles at the thought that men can thus sink to the level of tigers and hyenas, when once they break the bands with which the love of God and the fear of eternal justice chain down the wild beasts that slumber at the bottom of man's heart. A devouring and satanic thirst for evil, and for the ruin of other men, had taken the place of love, compassion, and pity. The country people themselves, once so mild and peaceable, but now driven to despair, abandoned their homes, dispersed themselves amongst the woods, and murdered all who fell into their hands.

Such was the state of prostration into which this unhappy country had been brought by the victory of Agincourt and the ignominious treaty of Troyes, which laid France and her *almost kingly dukedoms* at the feet of Henry V. of England. He was summoned hence in the midst of schemes of universal dominion, by which the combined armies of France and England were to be led to the conquest of the East, and the rescue of the Holy Sepulchre. The poor insane King of France soon followed him to the grave, and the crowns of France and England were placed upon the brow of the infant son of Henry, the regency being committed to his soldier-like and inflexible uncle, the Duke of Bedford (Shakespeare's John of Lancaster), whose iron grasp wrenched city after city from the weak and dissolute heir of the house of Valois.

Charles VII., or as he was still called, the Dauphin, *was losing his realm right joyously, amid sports and feasting*, with a selfish *insouciance* seldom equalled except by our own Charles II. His revelry was at last broken in upon by the tidings that Bedford was threatening Orleans, the key of the south of France, and the last hope of his well-nigh desperate cause. With the pusillanimity which usually follows reckless security, Charles was on the point of giving up all for lost, and retiring beyond the Rhone, when confused and mysterious rumours reached him of a marvellous maiden from the marches of Lorraine, who, in accordance with an old prophecy, was to deliver France from the stranger.

What were the antecedents, and what was the true character of this predestined champion, we shall now see :—

In the beginning of the fifteenth century two poor peasants called Jacques D'Arc and Isabelle Romée, lived at Domremy, a little village belonging to the immediate domains of the crown of France, situated on the borders of Champagne, Burgundy, and Lorraine. They were pious and honest people of good repute, who served God with simplicity of heart, brought up their children to labour and in the fear of the Lord, were pure in their words and just in their actions, and abode with their neighbours in Christian concord; earning their bread by cultivating their little field and rearing their cattle. Domremy is situated in a fair and solitary valley, divided into broad meadows and rich cornfields, interspersed with orchards and vineyards, and bathed by the joyous waters of the Meuse. The little house is still to be seen in which Joan of Arc lived with her simple parents, more than four hundred years ago. It is easily distinguished by an ancient stone statue over the door, representing a woman in armour, kneeling, with her hair streaming over her shoulders. The statue itself has been half destroyed by time, but below on the keystone of the arch over the door may be seen three coats of arms still in good preservation. That on the right contains a naked sword with the point turned upward, and supporting a royal crown; that on the left is charged with three ploughshares; and on the middle shield are emblazoned the three lilies of France, surmounted by a bunch of grapes and ears of corn, with the following inscription, "*Long flourish labour, long live King Louis,*" and the date 1481.

Little did the good Jacques d'Arc imagine that, for centuries to come, no traveller, whether mighty prince or lowly artisan, would pass his humble dwelling without stopping to gaze reverently at the three shields, and the figure of that kneeling woman; and yet so it is, though nearly five centuries have passed away, and with them many an illustrious and powerful family, whose place knows it no more; and so it will be as long as gratitude exists in the heart of man, because the hand of God was upon this house, and in 1411, Joan of Arc, the deliverer of France, was born beneath its roof.

The emblem of the naked sword and the royal crown was given to her family to hold in perpetual remembrance that she quitted her father's field, indicated by the emblem of the three ploughshares, to fly to the aid of her king in his last extremity, and at the point of the sword reconquer the crown of France.*

Joan had three brothers and a sister, but she was early distinguished from the rest by her singular goodness and piety, to which we have the evidence of more than thirty witnesses of all ranks, great and small, knights and priests, soldiers and peasants, men and women, who all agree in bearing witness to her pure and blameless life from her earliest childhood. They all agree, in declaring that her disposition was singularly mild and compassionate, guileless and simple, though prudent and enlightened; that she was modest in her words and actions;

* Görres.

laborious and humble, devoid of anger and impatience, and, though naturally timid, endued with unflinching courage in the fulfilment of her duties; but above all, these same weaknesses are never weary of extolling her piety, her ardent love of God, and perfect submission to His will. She lived in His presence, whether in her father's house or in the fields and woods where she tended her flock. His house was her favourite resort, and thither, whenever she could, she came daily to mass, and frequently to pray. She went often to confession and communion; when she was at work in the fields, and unable to go to the church, she would kneel down and pray, when she heard the bell ring. She loved to speak of God and the Blessed Virgin. Whilst other young girls after their day's labour went sporting and laughing along the roads, she would often be found praying in silence in some corner of the church, or on her knees before the crucifix. Yet was she neither sad nor gloomy, but the contrary: she was gay, and loved to see others gay. She was never accused of presuming on the graces she had received, but bore patiently the jests of her companions on her great devotion, the only thing with which they could reproach her. She censured no one, was benevolent and kindly to all, and, whenever she could, afforded help and consolation to all. One of the peasants of Domremy bore witness in his seventieth year, that the pious child had been loved by all the inhabitants of the village; another that she had attended him in an illness with the most compassionate care; another that she often slept upon the ground in order to give up her own bed to the poor, and that sometimes she was so carried away by her compassion, as to part with that which belonged properly to her parents. Any money which she could spare from her alms she took to the curé to offer up masses for her. The sacristan of Domremy bore witness that Joan had more than once reproached him for neglecting to ring the evening Angelus, and promised him money if he would be more exact in future.

In her early childhood she helped her brothers in field labour, and, alternately with the other children, drove the flocks of her father and his neighbours to pasture. As she grew older, her mother employed her chiefly in the house, and she was very skilful in spinning and sewing. She said on her trial that she would not be afraid to compete in spinning with any woman in Rouen. She had a few intimate friends among the young girls of the village, but generally preferred the society of older persons. As a last touch to this beautiful and feminine picture, we are told that she loved little children, and that they loved to be with her.

Joan's favourite recreation was to make a pilgrimage once a week to a little chapel called the *Hermitage of Notre Dame de Vermont*, the ruins of which may still be seen on a hill at the back of the village, near an old forest of oaks. This hermitage was an object of peculiar veneration in that country, and, like many of our famous places of pilgrimage, it seems to have been one of those spots where our fathers in more distant times celebrated their pagan worship, and where the early preachers and martyrs of the Gospel first kindled the lamp of the true faith. Hence there were still current amongst the people a number of mysterious traditions with regard to this place. Not far from the chapel flowed a medicinal spring, of which those afflicted with fever were wont to drink. It was said that in the old times of paganism fairies had dwelt there; that they might still sometimes be seen; and that roots of marvellous virtue were to be found near the spring. Close beside the fountain stood a fine old beech-tree, which was known in the neighbourhood by the name of the *Fairies' Tree*. Every spring, on the "Lætare" Sunday, the Lord of Domremy, followed by all the village, went in solemn procession to the Fairies' Tree. The children danced and sang round it, and adorned it with crowns and garlands of flowers. This was probably an old pagan festival converted by Christianity into a joyous welcoming of the month of May.

Joan kept this day with the other children, but, according to the report of the witnesses, she sang more than she danced, and reserved the greater number of her garlands for the image of Notre Dame de Vermont, before which she prayed and lighted tapers every Saturday.

The malice of her enemies afterwards sought to make a crime of this festival of the fountain, and of these pious pilgrimages to the forest chapel. They said that she had there held converse with fairies and practised sorcery, to which, and not to the hand of God, her victories were to be ascribed. But Joan made answer thus:—

"I have heard old people say that the fairies abode in that place, but I do not know whether it was true or not. To my knowledge I never saw them under the tree or elsewhere.

"I have seen the young girls hang garlands on the tree, and I have sometimes done so like the rest. I heard my brother say that it was said in the country that I had taken my resolve under the Fairies' Tree. Now it is not true, and I am opposed to such practices. I never had any magic roots. My voices never told me of such things."

Distant as was Domremy from the great roads and towns of the kingdom, the rumours of war had now reached its quiet

valley. All its inhabitants, with one exception, were strongly attached to their native sovereign. A neighbouring village, on the contrary, espoused the cause of Burgundy, and such was the exasperation excited by this terrible civil war that the children of the two villages sucked in hatred and enmity with their mothers' milk; in the evening after work they attacked each other, and waged mutual war. Joan did not remember ever to have taken part in these childish combats, but she remembered that she had more than once seen the children of her village return home seriously wounded. She confessed, too, that she had thought it would be a good thing (if such were the will of God) to cut off the head of the only Burgundian in Domremy. Doubtless the feeling passed away with her childhood, for we find her standing sponsor for a child together with this man, who always spoke of her with great respect.

This child, whom all the witnesses of her life praise so highly, whom the curé of Domremy regarded as the most gifted of his flock, and of whom the Chevalier des Ursins said before the judges that he ardently desired that Heaven had given him so perfect a daughter, knew not how to read or write; her poor parents had been able to teach her little beyond the Lord's Prayer, the "Hail, Mary," and the Creed. An old chronicle informs us of a fact such as we read of in the lives of many of the saints, that the peace of her soul and the power of her love gave her a mastery over creatures devoid of reason. "In her childhood," says this chronicle, "when she kept her sheep, the birds of the field and of the forest came to her when she called them, as to a beloved companion, and picked up the bread which she crumbled for them in her lap." Whether this be true, or only a beautiful legend invented by the love of the people for their pious heroine, it is certain that when her bitter enemies, in hope of finding materials to stain her fair renown, sent a messenger to Domremy to inquire into her conduct, he said on his return that he had learnt nothing which he would not willingly have heard of his own sister. Such was the love and reverence in which she was held by those in whose presence she had lived from her infancy.

The following is Joan's own narrative of the first of the marvellous visions in which the Great Guardian of the Church, the Archangel S. Michael, and the Virgin Martyrs, S. Catherine and S. Margaret, laid upon the village child the burden of the destiny of France:—

"All the good I have done for France," said she, "I have done through the grace and by the command of God, the King of Heaven, as it was revealed to me by His angels and saints,

and all that I know I have learnt only by divine revelation. It was by the command of God that I went to the king. I would rather have been torn to pieces by horses than have gone to him without permission of God, in Whose hands are all my actions. Upon Him and upon none other rested all my hope. Everything that the voices told me I have done to the best of my strength and knowledge. Now, they order me nothing but with the permission and pleasure of God, and all that I did in obedience to them, I think, has been well done.

"It is now seven years ago that the saints appeared to me for the first time; it was about noon on a summer's day. I was about thirteen years old, and was in the garden with my father. I heard the voice on my right hand, towards the church. I saw at the same time an apparition, surrounded by a great light. It had the form and appearance of a very good and holy man, but it had wings and was all surrounded with light, and accompanied by the angels of heaven, for the angels often come to Christians without their perceiving it; I have myself often seen them. This was the Archangel Michael. He seemed to me to have a very noble voice, but I was yet a very young child, and much frightened by this apparition. It was not until I had heard the voice three times that I knew it to be his. He taught and showed me so many things that at last I firmly believed in him. I have seen him and the angels with my own eyes, as clearly as I see you, my judges, and I believe with as firm a faith in what he said and did as I believe in the Passion and Death of Jesus Christ our Saviour; and what leads me to believe in him is the good doctrine, the good advice, and the help which he has always afforded me.

"He told me that before all things I was to be a good child, to behave myself well, and go often to church, and that God would support me. He told me of the great misery of the kingdom of France, and how I should make haste to help my king. He told me also that S. Catherine and S. Margaret would come to me, and that I was to do whatever they should command me, because they were sent from God to conduct and aid me with their counsels in all that I had to undertake.

"S. Catherine and S. Margaret appeared to me afterwards, as the angel had predicted. They ordered me to go to the Sire de Baudricourt, captain of the king at Vaucouleurs, who, indeed, would repulse me many times, but would finish by giving me people to lead me into the middle of France to Charles VII.; after which I should raise the siege of Orleans. I answered then that I was only a poor girl, who knew neither how to ride nor how to bear myself in war. They replied, that

I was to carry my banner boldly, that God would be my helper, and that I should aid my king to recover his kingdom, in spite of his enemies. 'Go in full trust,' they added, 'and when thou art once before thy king, there shall be a notable sign for thee, which shall make him believe in thy mission, and give thee a good reception.' They have directed me for seven years past, and lent me their aid in all my troubles and labours, and now there does not pass a day without their coming to visit me. I have asked them for nothing, except what concerned my mission, and that God would be pleased to assist the French, and protect their towns; for myself I have asked no reward but the salvation of my soul. From the first time that I heard their voices, I promised freely to God to remain a pure virgin in body and soul, if that were pleasing to Him, and they promised me to return to take me to Paradise, as I had prayed them to do."

Joan was alone in the world with her great secret; she had nobody to whom she could confide it, and above all she feared, not without reason, to open her mind to her father. How, indeed, could she persuade him to believe in apparitions which she alone had seen? It is remarkable that the old Jacques d'Arc had a vague presentiment of his child's destiny, and therefore Joan was narrowly watched by her parents. About two years had elapsed since the saints had appeared, when her mother told her at several different times that her father had dreamt that she had left home with men-at-arms, and that he had said to his sons,—“If I knew that such a thing was to happen to my daughter, I would order you to throw her into the water; and if you refused to do it, I would do it myself.”

Yet the years passed away, one after another, and the voices of the saints, which exhorted Joan to rise and go to the captain of the king at Vaucouleurs, grew ever more and more pressing, but no favourable opportunity offered itself for the execution of her design. On the contrary, everything seemed opposed to it. For, precisely at this period, a troop of Burgundians appeared in the neighbourhood of Domremy; the shepherds and labourers, who knew the wild habits of these guests, crossed the Meuse with their flocks, and took refuge in the little fortified town of Neufchâteau, in Lorraine. Jacques d'Arc and his family sought an asylum there with the rest, and lodged with an honest woman, who kept a kind of hostelry. Now this is the only foundation for a fable often afterwards repeated, to place Joan in a false light, and destroy the miraculous character of her mission, namely that she had been a servant at an inn, and accustomed to manage horses in taking them to water, and so had learned many things which

do not usually form part of the education of young girls.* An ingenious solution truly of the marvel attested by Alençon, Dunois, and others of the best lances of the most chivalrous country of Christendom, *that Joan wore her harness as knightly, and managed her war-horse with as much ease and grace, as if she had never done anything else in her life.*

The Maid at last found a confidant and assistant in her uncle, Durand Laxart, who went with her to De Baudricourt. The old knight at first laughed the idea of her mission to scorn, and recommended her uncle to put an end to it by a sound box on the ear. After the third interview, however, he gave her an escort to conduct her to the Dauphin.

"In the history of the Maid," says Bishop Gillis, "we recognize two characteristics which always distinguish the messengers of God,—in the *individual*, a simple and solid virtue, which never departs from the approved part of prudence; in the *messenger*, a supernatural energy, which cuts its way right onward against every appearance of probability, against every condition even of possibility, but which is nevertheless always borne out in the time of need by the ordinary course of Divine Providence." And so when men spoke to this young girl of thick forests, swollen rivers, robbers and brigands, which would beset her perilous journey of fifty leagues through the heart of a hostile country, she made answer, "I fear nothing, my God is with me: who will open a way for me to the Dauphin: for this was I born."

In obedience to her *Voices*, and to serve as a protection to her life and honour, the village girl now assumed the armour of a knight. At last she crossed the drawbridge of the castle of Chinon, where the Dauphin was then holding his court, and entering the splendidly lighted banquet-hall, she walked straight to Charles, who had disguised himself to test her supernatural knowledge: "In the name of God," said she, in that low, thrilling voice which is noticed by so many of her contemporaries, "in the name of God, gentle sire, you are the king and no other. I am called Joan the maiden, and I am sent hither by God to bring help to you and your kingdom." Charles was naturally cold and cautious, and had probably consented to see the marvellous maiden somewhat against his will; but he was struck by her instant recognition of him, and still more when, taking him aside from the company, she whispered to him a secret known only to herself. The king's unnatural mother, Isabella of Bavaria, had cast a doubt upon his claim to the throne of France. In his deep discouragement

* Görres.

ment, Charles had been thereby brought to doubt his own legitimacy, and had one day offered a secret prayer to God to make known to him if he were of the blood of the kings of France, and if so, to enable him to preserve his crown; if not, to permit him to escape into Spain or Scotland. Now, when Joan saw that he still distrusted her, she said to him, "I come to tell you, on the part of my Lord, that you are the true heir of France, and the son of the king, and I will lead you to Rheims to be consecrated," adding the particulars of his prayer. Charles's secretary mentions, in a letter written shortly afterwards, that what she said privately to the king no one knew, but that every one saw the change which she wrought in him, and Charles long afterwards confessed that she told him the particulars of this his secret prayer, and the place and circumstances under which it was made. Before accepting her aid, Charles deemed himself obliged, in prudence, to subject her to the examination of ecclesiastics, lest her supernatural knowledge should spring from an evil source. He sent her, therefore, to Poitiers, where she was subjected for the space of three weeks to a close examination as to every particular of her life and revelations. She answered every question with perfect simplicity and consistency. One of the objections raised was that if God wished to deliver the kingdom of France, He could do it without soldiers? "The men-at-arms," she said, "will fight, and God will give them the victory." And when asked how she hoped to be believed without a sign, she said she was not come to Poitiers to do signs or miracles, but her sign would be to raise the siege of Orleans. "Let the king but give me men-at-arms, many or few, and I will go."

At last, wearied out with the endless questions of the logicians of Poitiers, she exclaimed impatiently, "See, I know neither A nor B, but I come on the part of the King of heaven to raise the siege of Orleans, and to conduct the king to Rheims, where he shall be consecrated and crowned." She stated at this time that her mission included two other things; she was to deliver the Duke of Orleans from his captivity in England, and to drive the last Englishman out of France. The celebrated Æneas Sylvius, afterwards Pius II., less than thirty years after the death of Joan of Arc, bears this testimony to the result of the examination at Poitiers:—"The Dauphin, fearing to be deceived, had Joan examined by his confessor, the Bishop of Castres, a theologian of eminent science, and also committed her to the care of noble ladies. When she was questioned as to her faith, her answers were all conformable to the Christian religion; and when they investigated her

conduct, they found in her a virginal purity and the most strict morals. The examination lasted many days, and they could detect in her nothing feigned, nor any sort of falsehood or deception."

The doubts of Charles VII. were at last removed, and the representative of Charlemagne and S. Louis placed the fortunes of France in the hands of a girl of seventeen. He gave the Maid a suit of splendid armour, and charged the Duke of Alençon to collect together the men and supplies which she was to take to the relief of Orleans. Joan had herself prepared her banner, emblazoned with the holy name of Jesus, and she sent to the church of her patroness, S. Catherine, at Fierbois, for a sword marked with five crosses, which her saints had revealed to her would be found there under the high altar. Another banner, bearing the image of our Lord crucified, was to be borne by priests at the head of the array.

"The state of public feeling in France," says Professor Creasy, "was favourable to an enthusiastic belief in a divine interposition in favour of the party which had hitherto been unsuccessful and oppressed. The humiliations which had befallen the French royal family and nobility were looked on as the just judgments of God upon them for their vice and impiety. The misfortunes that had come upon France as a nation were believed to have been drawn down by national sins. The English, who had been the instrument of Heaven's wrath against France, seemed now, by their pride and cruelty, to be fitting objects of it themselves. France in that age was a profoundly religious country. The idea of a Providence that works only by general laws was wholly alien to the feelings of that age. Every political event, as well as every natural phenomenon, was believed to be the immediate result of a special mandate of God. This led to the belief that His holy angels and saints were constantly employed in executing His commands and mingling in the affairs of men. The Church encouraged these feelings, and at the same time sanctioned the current popular belief that hosts of evil spirits were also ever actively interposing in the current of earthly events, with whom sorcerers and wizards league themselves, and thereby obtain the exercise of supernatural power.

"Thus all things favoured the influence which Joan obtained both over friends and foes. The French nation, as well as the English and Burgundians, readily admitted that superhuman beings inspired her: the only question was, whether these beings were good or evil angels; whether she brought with her *airs from heaven or blasts from hell*. This question seemed to her countrymen to be decisively settled in her favour, by

the austere sanctity of her life, by the holiness of her conversation, but still more by her exemplary attention to all the services and rites of the Church. The Dauphin at first feared the injury that might be done to his cause, if he laid himself open to the charge of having leagued himself with a sorceress. Every imaginable test, therefore, was resorted to in order to set Joan's orthodoxy and purity beyond suspicion. At last, Charles and his advisers felt safe in accepting the services as those of a true and virtuous Christian and daughter of the Holy Church.

"It is, indeed, probable that Charles and some of his counsellors may have suspected Joan of being a mere enthusiast; and it is certain that Dunois, and others of the best generals, took considerable latitude in obeying or deviating from the military orders that she gave. But over the mass of the people and the soldiery, her influence was unbounded. While Charles and his doctors of theology, and court ladies, had been deliberating as to recognizing or dismissing the Maid, a considerable period had passed away, during which a small army, the last gleanings, as it seemed, of the English sword, had been assembled at Blois, under Dunois, La Hire, Xaintrailles, and other chiefs, who to their natural valour were now beginning to unite the wisdom that is taught by misfortune. It was resolved to send Joan with this force, and a convoy of provisions to Orleans. The distress of that city had now become urgent. But the communication with the open country was not entirely cut off; the Orleanais had heard of the holy Maid whom Providence had raised up for their deliverance, and their messengers urgently implored the Dauphin to send her to them without delay.

"Joan appeared at the camp at Blois, clad in a new suit of brilliant white armour, mounted on a stately black war-horse, with a lance in her right hand, which she had learned to wield with skill and grace. Her head was unhelmeted, so that all could behold her fair and expressive features, her deep-set and earnest eyes, and her long black hair, which was parted across her forehead, and bound by a ribbon behind her back. She wore at her side a small battle-axe, and the consecrated sword, marked out with three crosses, which had at her bidding been taken for her from the shrine of S. Catherine at Fierbois. A page carried her banner, which she had caused to be made and embroidered, as her *Voices* enjoined. It was of white satin, strewn with fleurs-de-lis, and on it were these words, "Jhesus, Maria," and the representation of our Saviour in His glory. Joan afterwards generally bore her banner herself in battle; she said that she loved her sword much, she loved her

banner forty times as much, and she loved to carry it because it could not kill any one.

"Thus accoutred she came to lead the troops of France, who looked with soldierly admiration on her well-proportioned and upright figure, the skill with which she managed her war-horse, and the easy grace with which she handled her weapons. Her military education had been short, but she had availed herself of it well. She had also the good sense not to interfere with the manœuvres of the troops; leaving these things to Dunois, and others whom she had the discernment to recognize as the best officers in the camp. Her tactics in action were simple enough. As she herself described them, '*I used to say to them, "Go boldly in among the English," and then I used to go boldly in myself.*' Such, as she told her inquisitors, was the only spell she used, and it was one of power. But while interfering little with the military discipline of the troops, in all matters of moral discipline she was inflexibly strict. All the abandoned followers of the camp were driven away. She compelled both generals and soldiers to go regularly to confession. Her chaplain and other priests marched with the army, under her orders, and at every halt an altar was set up.

"No oath or foul language passed without punishment or censure. Even the roughest and most hardened veterans obeyed her. They put off for a time the bestial coarseness which had grown on them during a life of bloodshed and rapine; and they felt that they must go forth in a new spirit to a new career, and acknowledged the beauty of the holiness in which the heaven-sent Maid was leading them to certain victory. Joan marched from Blois on the 25th of April, with a convoy of provisions for Orleans, accompanied by Dunois, La Hire, and the other chief captains of the French; and on the evening of the 28th, they approached the town. In the words of the old chronicler Hall: '*The Englishmen, perceiving that thei wilkin could not long continue for faute of vitaille and poulder, kepte not their watche so diligently as thei were accustomed, nor scoured not the countrey environed as they had before had ordained. Whiche negligence the citizens shut in perceiving, sent worde thereof to the French capitaines, with which Pucelle in the dedde tyme of the nighte, and in a greate rayne and thundere, with all their vitaille and artillery entered into the citie.*' When it was day, the Maid rode in solemn procession through the city, clad in complete armour, and mounted on a white horse. Dunois was by her side, and all the bravest knights of her army and of the garrison followed in her train. The whole population thronged around her; and men, women, and children strove to touch her garments, or

her banner, or her charger. They poured forth blessings on her, whom they already considered their deliverer. In the words used by two of them afterwards before the tribunal, which reversed the sentence, but could not restore the life of the Virgin martyr of France, *the people of Orleans, when they first saw her in their city, thought that it was an angel from heaven that had come down to save them.* Joan spoke gently in reply to their acclamations and addresses. She told them to fear God, and to trust in Him for safety from their enemies. She first went to the principal church, where the *Te Deum* was chanted, and then she took up her abode at the house of Jacques Bourcier, one of the principal citizens, whose wife was a matron of good repute. She refused to attend a splendid banquet which had been provided for her, and passed nearly all her time in prayer.

“When it was known by the English that the Maid was in Orleans, their minds were not less occupied about her than were the minds of those in the city, but it was in a very different spirit. The English believed in her supernatural mission as firmly as the French did; but they thought her a sorceress who had come to overthrow them by her enchantment. An old prophecy which had told them that a damsel from Lorraine was to save France, had long been current, and it was known and applied to Joan by foreigners as well as by the natives. For months the English had heard of the coming maid; and the tales of miracles which she was said to have wrought, had been listened to by the rough yeomen of the English camp with anxious curiosity and secret awe. She had sent a herald to the English generals before she marched for Orleans, and he had summoned them in the name of the Most High to give up to the Maid, who was sent by Heaven, the keys of the French cities which they had wrongfully taken; and he also solemnly adjured the English troops, whether archers or men of the companies of war, or gentlemen, or others who were before the city of Orleans, to depart thence to their homes, under peril of being visited by the judgments of God. On her arrival at Orleans, Joan sent another messenger; but the English scoffed at her from their towers, and threatened to burn her heralds. She determined, before she shed the blood of the besiegers, to repeat the warning with her own voice; and accordingly she mounted one of the boulevards of the town, which was within hearing of the Tourelles, occupied by the English; and thence she spoke to them, and bade them depart, otherwise they would meet with shame and woe. Sir William Gladsdale (whom the French call Glacidas) commanded the English post at the Tourelles, and he and another

English officer replied by bidding her go home and keep her cows, and by ribald jests that brought tears of shame and confusion into her eyes. But, though the English leaders vaunted aloud, the effect produced on their army by Joan's presence in Orleans was proved four days after arrival, when, on the approach of reinforcements and stores to the town, Joan and La Hire marched out to meet them, and escorted the long train of provision-waggon safely into Orleans, between the bastilles of the English, who cowered behind the walls, instead of charging fiercely and fearlessly, as had been their wont, on any French band that dared to show itself within reach.

"Thus far she had prevailed without striking a blow; but time was now come to test her courage amid the horrors of actual slaughter. On the afternoon of the day on which she had escorted the reinforcements into the city, while she was resting fatigued at home, Dunois had seized an advantageous opportunity of attacking the English bastille of S. Loup; and a fierce assault of the Orleanais had been made upon it, which the English garrison of the fort stubbornly resisted. Joan was roused by a sound which she believed to be that of her heavenly *Voices*; she called for her arms and horse, and, quickly equipping herself, she mounted to ride off to where the fight was raging. In her haste she had forgotten her banner; she rode back, and, without dismounting, had it given to her from the window, and then she galloped to the gate, whence the sally had been made. On her way she met some of the wounded French who had been carried back from the flight. '*Ha!*' she exclaimed, '*I never can see French blood flow without my hair standing on end!*' She rode out of the gate, and met the tide of her countrymen, who had been repulsed from the English fort, and were flying back to Orleans in confusion. At the sight of the holy Maid and her banner they rallied and renewed the assault; Joan rode forward at their head, waving her banner and cheering them on. The English quailed at what they believed to be the charge of hell; S. Loup was stormed, and its defenders put to the sword, except some few, whom Joan succeeded in saving. All her woman's gentleness returned when the combat was over. It was the first time that she had ever seen a battle-field. She wept at the sight of so many bleeding corpses; and her tears flowed doubly when she reflected that they were the bodies of Christian men who had died without confession. The next day was Ascension Day, and it was passed by Joan in prayer. But on the following morrow it was resolved by the chiefs of the garrison to attack the English forts on the south of the river. For this purpose they crossed the river in boats; and, after some

severe fighting, in which the Maid was wounded in the heel, both the English bastilles of the Augustins and S. Jean de Blanc were captured. The Tourelles were now the only posts the besiegers held on the south of the river. But that post was formidably strong, and, by its command of the bridge, it was the key to the deliverance of Orleans. It was known that a fresh English army was approaching, under Fastolfe, to reinforce the besiegers; and, should that army arrive while the Tourelles were yet in the possession of their comrades, there was great peril of all the advantages which the French had gained being nullified, and of the siege being again actively carried on.

"It was resolved, therefore, by the French to assail the Tourelles at once, while the enthusiasm which the presence and the heroic valour of the Maid had created was at its height. But the enterprise was difficult. The rampart of the tête-du-pont, or landward bulwark, of the Tourelles was steep and high; and Sir John Gladsdale occupied this all-important fort with five hundred archers and men-at-arms, who were the very flower of the English army.

"Early in the morning of the 7th of May some thousand of the French troops in Orleans heard Mass and attended the confessional by Joan's orders; and then, crossing the river in boats, as on the preceding day, they assailed the bulwark of the Tourelles *with light hearts and heavy hands*. But Gladsdale's men, encouraged by their bold and skilful leader, made a resolute and able defence. The Maid planted her banner on the edge of the fosse; and then, springing down into the ditch, she placed the first ladder against the wall, and began to mount. An English archer sent an arrow at her, which pierced her corslet and wounded her severely between the neck and shoulder. She fell bleeding from the ladder; and the English were leaping down from the wall to capture her, but her followers bore her off. She was carried to the rear, and laid upon the grass; her armour was taken off, and the anguish of her wound and the sight of her blood made her at first tremble and weep. But her confidence in her celestial mission soon returned: her patron saints seemed to stand before her and reassure her. She sat up and drew the arrow out with her own hands. Some of the soldiers who stood by wished to stanch the blood by saying a charm over the wound; but she forbade them, saying that she did not wish to be cured by unhallowed means. She had the wound dressed with a little oil, and then bidding her confessor come to her, she betook herself to prayer.

"In the meanwhile, the English in the bulwark of the

Tourelles had repulsed the oft-renewed efforts of the French to scale the wall. Dunois, who commanded the assailants, was at last discouraged, and gave orders for a retreat to be sounded. Joan sent for him and the other generals, and implored them not to despair. '*By God,*' she said to them, '*you shall soon enter in there. Do not doubt it. When you see my banner wave again, up to the wall, to your arms again; the fort is yours. For the present, rest a little, and take some food and drink.*' They did so, says the old chronicler of the siege, for they obeyed her marvellously. The faintness caused by her wound had now passed off, and she headed the French in another rush against the bulwark. The English, who had thought her slain, were alarmed at her reappearance; while the French pressed furiously and fanatically forward. A Biscayan soldier was carrying Joan's banner. She had told the troops that directly the banner touched the wall, they should enter. The Biscayan waved the banner forward from the edge of the fosse, and touched the wall with it; and then all the French host swarmed madly up the ladders that were now raised in all directions against the English fort. At this crisis the efforts of the English garrison were distracted by an attack from another quarter. The French troops who had been left in Orleans had placed some planks over the broken arch of the bridge, and advanced across them to the assault of the Tourelles on the northern side. Gladsdale resolved to withdraw his men from the landward bulwark, and concentrate his whole force in the Tourelles themselves. He was passing for this purpose across the drawbridge that connected the Tourelles and the tête-du-pont, when Joan, who by this time had scaled the walls of the bulwark, called out to him, '*Surrender, surrender to the King of Heaven. Ah! Glacidas, you have foully wronged me with your words, but I have great pity on your soul and on the souls of your men.*' The Englishman, disdainful of her summons, was striding across the drawbridge, when a cannon-shot from the town carried it away, and Gladsdale perished in the water that ran beneath. After his fall, the remnant of the English abandoned all further resistance. Three hundred of them had been killed in the battle, and two hundred were made prisoners.

"The broken arch was speedily repaired by the exulting Orleanais, and Joan made her triumphal re-entry into the city by the bridge that had long been closed. Every church in Orleans rang out its gratulating peal, and throughout the night the sounds of rejoicings echoed and the bonfires blazed up from the city. But in the lines and forts, which the besiegers yet retained on the northern shore, there was

anxious watching of the generals, and there was desponding gloom among the soldiery. Even Talbot now counselled retreat. On the following morning the Orleannais from their walls saw the great forts called *London* and *S. Lawrence* in flames, and witnessed their invaders busy in destroying the stores and munitions which had been relied on for the destruction of Orleans. Slowly and sullenly the English army retired; and not before it had drawn up in battle array opposite to the city, as if to challenge the garrison to an encounter. The French troops were eager to go out and attack them, but Joan forbade it."

An altar was erected in the open air, before which she knelt, with all the army and the citizens of Orleans, and two masses were celebrated in the deepest calm right opposite the enemy. The English themselves dared not disturb the religious quiet of the scene. When the second mass was finished, Joan, still kneeling, inquired if the faces of the enemy were still turned towards the French; being assured that they were turned in the direction of Meung, she exclaimed—"They are going; in God's name let them depart, and let us return thanks to God. We will not pursue them, because to-day is Sunday." Many a knight, eager for glory and plunder, chafed inwardly to see the enemy retire in such good order, with banners flying. Some even dashed forward in pursuit, and captured some pieces of artillery, but Joan ceased not to repeat—"Let the English go, and kill them not; they are departing, that is enough for me."

"Within three months," says Professor Creasy, "from her first interview with the Dauphin, Joan had fulfilled the first part of her promise, the raising of the siege of Orleans. Within three months more she had fulfilled the second part also, and had stood, with her banner in her hand, by the high altar at Rheims, while he was anointed and crowned as King Charles VII. of France. In the interval she had taken Jargeau, Troyes, and other strong places, and she had defeated an English army in a fair field at Patay. The enthusiasm of her countrymen knew no bounds; but the importance of her services, and especially of her primary achievements at Orleans, may perhaps be best proved by the testimony of her enemies. There is extant a fragment of a letter from the Regent Bedford to his royal nephew, Henry VI., in which he bewails the turn the war has taken, and especially attributes it to the raising of the siege of Orleans by Joan. Bedford's own words, which are preserved in Rymer, are as follows:—"At the whiche tyme, after the adventure fallen to the persone of my cousin of Salisbury, whom God assoile,

there felle, by the hand of God as it seemeth, a great strok upon your people that were assembled there in grete nombre, caused in grete partie, as ye trowe, of lakke of sadde beleve, and of unlevefulle doubte, that thei hadde of a disciple and lyme of the Feende, called the Pucelle, that used enchantments and sorcerie. The whiche strooke and discomfiture nott oonly lessed in grete partie the nombre of your people there, but as well withdrewe the courage of the remenant in marveillous wyse, and couraiged your adverse partie and ennemys to assemble them forthwith in grete nombre.' ”

While the sacred Chrism brought from heaven for the coronation of Clovis was poured upon the head of the king, the poor maiden who had brought him to that hour of triumph stood beside him with her banner in her hand, and when the solemn rites were over she knelt before him weeping, and said—“ Gentle king, now is performed the good pleasure of God that I should raise the siege of Orleans, and bring you to this city of Rheims, to receive the sacred oil, showing that you are the true king, to whom belongs the kingdom of France.” All present were moved to tears at the humble bearing of the maiden in this moment of her triumph. “ What I have done,” she often repeated, “ was only as a minister; ” and when they told her that they had never read anything like it in a book: “ My master,” she answered, “ has a book in which scarcely any clerk can read, be his clerkship never so perfect.”

Her father and eldest brother were present at the gorgeous scene, in the midst of which it would seem that her young heart was shadowed by some presentiment of approaching death, and by a yearning after the peaceful joys of childhood and the home which she was to look upon no more. When she beheld the great joy of the people as the royal procession was returning from the coronation, she said to the Archbishop of Rheims, who rode beside her: “ This is a good people; I have yet seen no people so joyful as they at the coming of their noble king. Please God I may have the good fortune, when my life is finished, to be buried in this land.” “ Ah! Joan,” asked the Archbishop, with emotion, “ where, then, do you hope to die?” “ Where it shall please God,” answered she, “ for I know no more than you of the time and place; and would it were God’s will that I might now depart and put away my armour, and go and serve my father and mother, keeping their sheep along with my sisters and brothers, who would be right joyful to see me again!”

It has been the opinion of most historians, even amongst those who have recognized something extraordinary in the

mission of Joan of Arc, that she was either unfaithful to it, or that she exaggerated its extent. (Görres represents her as overpersuaded by the king to remain with the army.) Such is not the judgment formed after careful investigation, either by Professor O'Hagan or Bishop Gillis.

I have no intention, says the latter, of entering here into a discussion on mystical theology, but will only observe that it is sometimes exceedingly difficult for the subjects of supernatural inspiration to know the exact limit where the supernatural stream meets the ordinary current of human thought. Joan might, therefore, have been mistaken on some minor points, without being under any delusion as to the extent of her mission as a whole. Now we learn what was her own belief on this point from the testimony of the Duke of Alençon, her most intimate associate, which agrees with other evidence brought forward on her trial. According to this she was commissioned to do four things: to deliver Orleans, to crown the king at Rheims, to expel the English from France, and to deliver the Duke of Orleans from his prison-house. Now, of these four things, she accomplished two in her own person; the two others were effected a few years after her death. And by what human power could they have been brought to pass, except as a necessary consequence of the victories of Joan of Arc? If, then, they are truly to be attributed to her courage and to the *prestige* of her name, why should we refuse to her, who not only foresaw and foretold them, but who offered herself for their accomplishment, the right to judge of them as a whole, and to declare that they were included in her mission? And if the accomplishment of a part of that mission was delayed beyond the period of her life by the crimes of those for whose benefit it was intended, would this be the first example of the effects of a mission from on High being delayed by similar causes, and without fault in the messenger? Her wise contemporary, the Chancellor Gerson writes:—"If it has come to pass that the Maid has failed to fulfil to the utmost our expectation, and her own, we must not, therefore, conclude that the things which hath been wrought have been the work of the evil spirit rather than of God; but it may happen, which God forbid, by the wrath of Heaven, because of our ingratitude and blasphemies." Gerson could not have written words more prophetic, if he had lived amidst the intrigues of the court at Chinon. And as to Joan, from whom they wrung so many bitter tears, she seemed to have a presentiment that she should not finish her course, when she said so often and so earnestly to the Dauphin, "Let us make haste, I shall not last more than a year;" and when she answered the peasants of Domremy, who asked her if she did not fear death, "I fear but one thing, and that is treason." Her *Voices* declared to her plainly at Melun, "Joan, thou shalt be taken before the feast of S. John; it must be so." It was not Joan who was unfaithful, but Charles who was unworthy; it was his base ministers who betrayed the deliverer of their country, who left her to cry in vain as she lay bleeding beneath the rampart of Paris, "The king, the king, let but the king show himself." It was they, and their intrigues, that led her in her sublime

indignation, to suspend her armour and her sword at S. Denis before the image of our Lady, and the relics of the Apostle of Paris ; it was they who tore her from the foot of the altar, where she wished to remain with her arms ; it was they who, in the midst of general grief and indignation, suffered that fine army of volunteers to be dispersed, that miraculous army, which had followed her banner without pay, and without pillage ; it was they, lastly, who forsook her and her standard on the Boulevards of Marley, and enabled the Duke of Burgundy to sell her as a sorceress for 10,000 crowns of gold ; it was they (far more than her English and Burgundian foes) who at last fired her funeral pile and cast her ashes into the Seine.

"Yet in one sense," says Professor O'Hagan, "her mission did end at Rheims. The faith of the people still followed her, but her enemies,—not the English, but those in the heart of the court of Charles,—began to be too powerful for her. We may, indeed, conceive what a hoard of envy and malice was gathering in the hearts of those hardened politicians at seeing themselves superseded by a peasant girl. They, accustomed to dark and tortuous ways, could not comprehend or coalesce with the divine simplicity of her designs and means. A successful intrigue was formed against her. It was resolved to keep her still in the camp as a name and figure, but to take from her all power, all voice in the direction of affairs. So accordingly it was done. The French, in August, besieged Paris, then in the hands of the English. The siege was undertaken contrary to her advice. She took part, nevertheless, in the assault with her accustomed fearlessness, and was wounded. The assault was repelled, but Joan, rising from her wound, said she was assured that if the assault were renewed they would win the city. In answer to that exhortation they put her by force upon a horse and sent her back to the camp, while a retreat was sounded. And then they cast the entire responsibility of the failure upon her.

"What pangs must that poor heart have suffered during that weary time, belied and discredited, burning with love of France, and made impotent to serve her ! She still, however, fought as usual, and when the Burgundians laid siege to the town of Compiègne, on the Oise, she threw herself into it to defend it. That very day she headed a sally against the besiegers. But her followers retired, and she, who was ever in the front, was left alone. She was surrounded and captured by the Bastard of Vendomme, a knight in the service of John of Luxembourg, on the 23rd of May, 1430, a little more than a year from the deliverance of Orleans."

The holiness and heroism of her conduct during the year she was in arms, are attested by a multitude of witnesses. "Dunois and the Duke of Alençon," says Professor O'Hagan, "bear testimony to what they term her extraordinary talents for war, and her perfect fearlessness in action, but in all other things she was the most simple of creatures. She wept, when she saw men slain in battle, to think that they should have died without confession. She wept at the abominable epithets which the English heaped upon her; but she was without a trace of vindictiveness." She never killed a single enemy in battle, for she shrank from the shedding of blood. She simply went forward with her banner, making little use of her sword, but defending herself with her lance, or with a little axe which she carried at her girdle. "She was once seen," he continues, "resting the head of a wounded Englishman on her lap, comforting and consoling him. In her diet she was abstemious in the extreme, rarely eating until evening, and then, for the most part, only of bread and water, sometimes mixed with wine. In the field she slept in her armour, but when she came into a city, she always sought out some honourable matron, under whose protection she placed herself; and there is wonderful evidence of the atmosphere of purity which she diffused around her, her very presence banishing from men's hearts all evil thoughts and wishes. Her conversation, when it was not of the war, was entirely of religion. She confessed often, and received communion twice in the week. 'And it was her custom,' says Dunois, 'at twilight every day to retire to the church and make the bells be rung for half an hour; and she gathered the mendicant religious who followed the king's army, and she put herself in prayer, and made them sing an antiphon of the Blessed Mother of God.' From presumption, as from superstition, she was entirely free. When women brought her crosses and chaplets to bless, she said, 'How can I bless them; your own blessing would be as good as mine.' She ever yearned after the union of Frenchmen, and on the very day of the coronation at Rheims she dictated a touching letter to the Duke of Burgundy, conjuring him to be no longer an enemy to his country, but to let the past be forgiven in Christian peace. But of negotiations with the English, she was supremely impatient. 'I tell you,' she often repeated, 'there is no peace to be made with the English except at the point of the lance.'"

She was now a prisoner in the hands of John of Luxembourg, a vassal of the Duke of Burgundy; but from the moment of her capture the English set their hearts upon ob-

taining possession of her. Her terror of falling into their hands led her to throw herself from the town of Beaurevoir, where she was imprisoned, at the peril of her life and contrary to the command of her saints.

"Their hatred of Joan," says Professor O'Hagan, "was something wholly indescribable, and from the beginning they had spread the most abominable slanders concerning her. They were resolved upon her destruction,—not merely upon killing her, for that would avail little, while her memory remained a beacon for France; but upon blasting her name and its influence, stamping upon her for ever the brand of evil, and extinguishing in infamy that light which had been of such disastrous omen to them. They designed to have her condemned by an ecclesiastical tribunal as a blasphemer and a sorceress.

"Their chief instrument was Pierre Cauchon, Bishop of Beauvais. That he acted with deliberate iniquity it is by no means necessary for us to believe. There are many contemporary testimonies highly favourable to him, and in the very brief of Pope Calixtus III., by which the process of revision was instituted, he is called *vir bonæ memoriæ*. But all his words and acts throughout this business show that his judgment was radically perverted by faction and ambition. He had been always a strong partisan of the Burgundians, had attained the high dignities of rector and conservator of the privileges of the University of Paris (the most Burgundian of corporations),* and was held in great esteem by Philip, Duke of Burgundy, who bestowed upon him the bishopric of Beauvais. When Beauvais fell into the hands of Charles VII., he was driven from the possession of his see, and took refuge in England with the Cardinal of Winchester (the Cardinal Beaufort of Shakespeare), who took him wholly under his patronage. He became a devoted adherent of the house of Lancaster, and the English promised him the archbishopric of Rouen. Thus all his feelings, his resentment for the past, his hopes for the future, were bound up with the maintenance of the English power in France, and he naturally regarded with abhorrence whatsoever threatened that power. But not only were the feelings of the bishop enlisted against Joan; that sentiment was strongly shared by all the ecclesiastics in the English or Burgundian interest, and, foremost among them, by the University of Paris. The party spirit which divided the nation ran high, as we may conceive, among the clergy too. And

* At the Council of Constance he defended the murder of the Duke of Orleans against Gerson.—*Görres*.

when the College of Poitiers absolved her from the taint of sorcery, and declared that Charles might lawfully use her services, the opposite party were all the more loud in pronouncing her a witch: to this their position forced them; for if she were sent from God, what was to be thought of their cause? So that not alone with the English rulers and soldiers, but with a large body of French ecclesiastics, and amongst them many learned and able men, the belief in the sorcery of Joan acquired almost the strength of a first principle. We should bear this always in mind in judging of the tragedy that followed.

"The preparations for her trial slowly proceeded. Commissioners were sent into her own country to take depositions as to her early life and habits. These depositions were evidently too favourable to her. Some idle rumours were gathered, such as that she had been at one time servant at an inn, and there learned the management of horses and the use of arms—a statement which, though shown to be without foundation, was afterwards reproduced by Monstrelet, and copied from him by Hume; some simple calumnies, such as a gross charge in reference to De Baudricourt; some vague accusations of superstition in connection with the Fairy Tree. But all these were felt to be worthless, and the depositions were suppressed in the record. Joan was indicted and condemned out of her own lips.

"The Cardinal of Winchester, the Duke of Bedford, and the Earl of Warwick, the tutor of the young king, assembled in Rouen for the trial. Their all-powerful influence was felt at every stage, but of their presence the public proceedings give no trace. There came also from Paris many doctors of high repute, but all strong partisans. The see of Rouen was then vacant, but territorial jurisdiction for the trial was obtained, though with some difficulty, from the Vicar-capitular and Chapter of Rouen. When the first public session was held in the Royal Chapel of the Castle of Rouen, on the 21st of February, 1431, the bishop sat with no less than forty-two assessors, viz., fifteen doctors in theology, five doctors of civil and canon law, seven bachelors in theology, eleven bachelors in canon law, and four licentiates in civil law. When the court sat, a formal citation was delivered to the apparitor to be served upon Joan in her prison. In his return to this writ the apparitor relates two requests which she made at the time of citation: first, that the ecclesiastics of the side of France, as well as those of the side of England, might sit upon her trial; and secondly, that she might be permitted to hear mass.

"The first request was passed over in silence ; the second was refused, 'in consideration of the crimes of which she is accused and the deformity of the garb in which she perseveres.' She was then brought before the tribunal, and an oath tendered to her, to answer truly to whatsoever should be demanded of her. But she peremptorily refused to take the oath in that form. She would answer fully, she said, as to her own acts ; but as to her revelations from God, she had confided them to no one but Charles, 'whom she calls her king ;' nor would she to any other if her head were to be cut off. She ultimately took the oath to answer concerning matters of faith, reserving to herself the right not to answer as to the secrets of her revelations. She was then minutely examined before the full court of assessors for five successive days. At the end of that period the Bishop resolved, for reasons which we may divine, that her further examination should be conducted in the prison, in the presence of four or five persons selected by himself. She was accordingly for six days further, and generally twice a day, sifted in the prison by these special examiners, astute and practised men. It is hard to describe the effect which the perusal of these examinations leaves upon the mind,* or what an impression it gives of her righteousness and good sense, her piety and humility, and her unshaken faith in the reality of her own inspirations. 'I believe,' she said, 'firmly, and as firmly as I believe the Christian faith, and that God redeemed us from the pains of hell, that my *Voices* came from God and by His ordinance.' Her *Voices*, she said, had been with her from the beginning, and she had always obeyed them except when she leaped from the tower of Beaurevoir. They were still daily communing with her in her cell, and telling her to answer boldly to her questioners. Her accusers put to her the mystery hidden from man, and asked her if she was in a state of grace. 'If I am,' she answered, 'may God keep me in it ; if I am not, may God put me into it. I would grieve more than for the whole world, if I knew that I were not.' Yet, she added, that she did not believe that if she were in mortal sin S. Catherine and S. Margaret would come to her. She was asked why, if she were not in sin, she confessed so often. 'One can never,' she said, 'cleanse one's conscience too much.' She was asked, if S. Catherine and S. Margaret hated the English. 'They hate what God hates, and love what God loves ?' Does God, then, hate the English ? 'Of the

* The impression produced upon the mind of a stout English Baron who was present at the trial was characteristically expressed :—"In truth, it is a good honest maid if she were but an English woman !"

love or hatred which God bears to the English, or what He means to do with their souls, I know nothing; but I know that they will all be driven forth of the realm of France, except those who will die there.' She was accused of having prevented peace. 'No,' she said, 'I did all in my power to make peace with the Duke of Burgundy; but as to the English, the peace to be made with them, is that they go back to their own country of England.' She was asked whether she had placed more confidence in her banner or her sword. 'My trust,' she said, 'was neither in sword nor banner, but was wholly in God.' She was asked if she had not sinned in leaving her father and mother against their wish. She said that if she had offended therein they had forgiven her; that in all things else she had obeyed them, but that in this she was bound to obey God rather than them, and if she had a hundred fathers and mothers, and were the daughter of a king, she would have done likewise.

"Yet (for the truth must be told) it is evident that on one point Joan was guilty of prevarication. She had, as we said, refused at the beginning to take the oath to answer simply everything which was asked of her; for she apprehended that questions might be put to her which she could not lawfully answer; and this determination she persisted in throughout, although at the commencement of every examination the same scene was repeated of extreme importunity on the part of her examiners to induce her to take the oath without restriction. Now, amongst other subjects upon which she was closely pressed, was the sign which she had given to Charles VII., by which he recognized her divine mission. That sign consisted, as we have seen, of the revelation to him of his doubts as to his legitimacy, and of his secret prayer. With Joan's feelings towards the king, she would sooner have died than publish such a thing to the world. Accordingly for many days she met the question with a simple refusal to answer. 'You will not,' she said, 'extract that from my lips.' Her examiners having still returned to it the more eagerly on that account, she at last cried out—'Would you wish me to perjure myself?' And immediately after, as if seeing there was no escape, she commenced a story about an angel having brought from Heaven a crown of gold and jewels, and placed it on the king's head in the hall of Chinon. An endeavour has been made to explain this as an allegory; and that she herself was the angel who brought to the king the crown of France. Surely it was simpler to say, with Joan herself, afterwards on the point of death, that it was a fiction, in which, tortured as

she was, she took refuge—a fiction, not a perjury, for it was expressly excluded from the compass of her oath.

"The great point upon which she was urged was her assumption of male attire, contrary to a canon of the early Church; but this she said she had done because she was so commanded from on High. On one matter they were more successful in ensnaring her—that of submission to the Church. They asked her would she submit the truth of her visions to the decision of the Church. She said she referred herself to God and His holy angels. They told her that it was not to the Church triumphant, but to the Church militant, that she was required to submit. It is evident that she construed their meaning to be, that she should submit her revelations to them, her judges, by whom she knew that she was prejudged, and she refused to make the required submission. Yet, even in that her deep sense of faith pointed out at last the true solution; and she said, when she was brought out to receive sentence: 'I appeal to God and our Lord the Pope.' 'We cannot go so far as to seek the Pope,' cried the Bishop of Beauvais; 'every ordinary is judge in his own diocese.' Her *Voices*, she said, promised her salvation, but conditionally upon her preserving her virginity, of body and soul. They also promised her deliverance from her enemies, but in what way she knew not; but for the most part, they said, it would be through a great victory; and they said to her: 'Take all patiently, neither be solicitous concerning thy martyrdom; thou shalt come finally into the kingdom of Paradise.' And she called it martyrdom for the pain and adversity which she endures in the prison; and she knows not whether she shall suffer yet greater pains, but she commits herself to God.

"Out of her answers were culled carefully such as were conceived to tell against her; and these were digested into twelve articles, which were sent for the opinion of the University of Paris,—the opinion of that body whose sentiments we have seen, could not long be doubtful. They condemned the propositions sent to them, as blasphemous and heretical; and soon after the answer came back, Joan was formally condemned in a full assembly of the assessors, and on the morrow of Pentecost, in the year 1481, was led out to receive the doom of a sorceress and apostate.

"In this dreadful trial she seems to have been abandoned to her own strength. She had faced death a hundred times in the field with perfect calmness, but this chalice was of another kind. That agony of fear of death which sometimes assails the finest natures overcame her, and she shrank from the faggot and the fierce flame. 'Give me,' she said, 'I will

sign a retraction.' So a paper was put into her hands to sign, by which she declared herself misled by her *Voices*, and renounced the use of male attire.* She was sentenced, as a merciful commutation, to perpetual imprisonment, with bread and water. This sentence she ought legally to have undergone in the ecclesiastical prison; but the Bishop of Beauvais gave her up again to the English, who led her back to her own cell.

"And now we may ask one question. A full twelvemonth had elapsed since she had been taken prisoner; what did her king, Charles VII., do for her in that time?—did he make a single effort to save her who had given him back his crown and kingdom? He had the wealth of cities which she had won for him—he might have offered to ransom her, so long at least as she was in Burgundian hands. He had many noble captives, prisoners of her victories,—he might have offered them in exchange, or justly threatened their lives if a hair of her head were injured. Or, if everything else failed, ought he not to have put himself at the head of the chivalry of France, and marched to rescue her or perish? History has to relate, beyond all recorded ingratitude, that he made no sign, did not even speak one word on her behalf. On the contrary, there is the clearest evidence that the coterie around him were filled with base satisfaction at getting rid of her, and probably looked to her death almost as eagerly as the English. As for Charles, his feeling was not *that*, but was simple indifference. He was enslaved to ignoble pleasure; and what can be more dead to gratitude or duty than the heart of a voluptuary? It was of Agnes Sorel that he thought, and not of the pure maiden Joan. Yet she never dreamed of reproaching him; throughout her trial she remained full of loyalty, as enthusiastic and tender as when she knelt at his feet at Chinon or at Rheims. In the very sermon which was preached to her at her condemnation, she bore in silence all that was said against herself; but when the preacher called her king a heretic and a schismatic, she arose and reprimanded him, and said that her king was the noblest of Christians, and the truest to the faith and to the Church.

"She was now condemned to perpetual imprisonment, but the English never meant to be so baulked of their prey.

* According to the evidence of the apparitor, who read the retraction to her, it simply contained a promise on the part of Joan to lay aside her arms and male attire, and something else which had escaped his memory. Instead of this short declaration they made her sign, or, at all events, attached to the minutes of the trial as having been signed by her, a long document acknowledging all the grievous charges alleged against her.

What care they had for her we can judge from one circumstance. During the course of her trial she became seriously ill. The Earl of Warwick summoned the best physician in Rouen, and told him to attend her well. 'For,' said he, 'my king has bought her dear, and holds her dear, and would not on any account that she died a natural death, or otherwise than by the hands of justice at the stake.' What plot was laid to bring to pass the tragedy which ensued, will never be fully known. One witness afterwards said, that her woman's clothes which she had adopted in obedience to her sentence, were taken away from her during the night, and her male attire alone left beside her, so that she had no choice but to assume it. And this is highly credible, for having at her retraction finally abjured the garb of a man, how else, except but by the order of her keepers, did she come by it? That she was found in her dungeon a few days after in her male dress is unquestionable, and this was seized on as conclusive evidence of her obstinacy and relapse. It must, however, be added, that she plainly repented of and recalled her abjuration, and when the bishop and some of the officials visited her in prison, she declared openly that she had sinned in denying her revelations, and asserted anew that her *Voices* were from God. And then the bishop told the Earl of Warwick to be of good cheer, for that all was finished. This was upon Sunday. On Tuesday the Bishop of Beauvais summoned the judges once more, and on Wednesday morning, a good friar, Martin, l'Advenu, was sent to hear her confession, and to announce to her that she was that day to be led out and burnt. He was accompanied by Brother Jean Toutmouillé, who gives the following account of the interview:—When he announced to the poor woman the death that she was to die the same day, and that so her judges had ordered and understood, and when she heard of the hard and cruel death that was near at hand, she began to cry grievously and piteously, and to lie down and rend her hair. 'Alas!' cried she; 'they treat me horribly and cruelly, that my clean and pure body, which was never tainted, should to-day be consumed and reduced to ashes! Ah! I would rather be beheaded seven times over, than to be thus burned. Alas! if I had been in a prison of the Church, to which I submitted myself, and if I had been guarded by churchmen, and not by my enemies and adversaries, it would not have so miserably mischanced with me as it now has. Oh! I appeal to God, the Great Judge, as to the great wrong and evil they have done me!' And here she complained marvellously of the oppression and violence she had suffered in prison.

"But as soon," says Görres, "as her first grief had thus exhausted itself, and the friar had given her some consolation, the pure brightness of her serene and submissive soul shone through her tears, as the sun emerges from amid the storms and clouds of night. Henceforth, her spirit, casting off the cares of the world, turned only towards its God. If she now wept, it was only in imploring mercy for a repentant sinner, about to appear before the Sovereign Judge. She made her confession to Brother l'Advenu, and begged with extreme earnestness for the Holy Communion, which had been so long denied to her most earnest entreaties. The friar, not knowing if he could grant her request, went to inform the bishop, who thereupon consulted with several doctors, and decided that she might have the Communion, or whatever else she desired. By this decision the judges really acquitted the Maid, and acknowledged themselves guilty, as they permitted the priest to absolve her of the very sins for which they were about to excommunicate her. If the priest's absolution was valid, and Joan worthy to receive the Blessed Body of our Lord, they could not exclude her from the Church as guilty of heresy.

"Therefore, the Holy Sacrament was brought to the victim, but without the usual ceremonies, either for fear of the English, or to prevent the affair from becoming known. The friar was indignant thereat, and demanded that all the proper rites should be observed. Then the Divine Body of Jesus Christ was brought in great pomp, with many candles, and those who accompanied It sang the litanies of the dying, saying at every response, 'Pray for her!' With the most humble piety, and abundance of tears, Joan received for the last time the Communion from the hands of the friar."

When she was led forth weeping to her death, she once more beheld her judges sitting cold and stern. She saw the pitying faces of the people and the fierce eyes of the English soldiery as they stood in arms around the pile where she was to suffer. "Ah! Bishop, Bishop," said she to the Bishop of Beauvais, "I die through you; if you had put me in the prison of the Church and given me fit keepers, this would not have befallen me!" While her sentence was about to be read, she fell on her knees, invoking God and the Blessed Virgin, S. Michael, S. Catharine, and S. Margaret; and she asked of all to pray for her; and from her judges, from the bishop, and all, she implored that they would say a mass for her soul. Every one was melted to tears, except some of the brutal soldiery, who cried out, "Come, priests, make haste; do you mean to keep us here till dinner-time?" Her sentence was then read, and she was handed over to the executioner.

She asked for a cross ; and a soldier, breaking a staff in two, made a rude cross and gave it to her. Such as it was, she pressed it to her bosom, but she implored that a crucifix should be brought, that it might be held before her eyes when she was dying. There was a high scaffold erected, and the faggots placed on the top, that her death might be visible to all ; and that, being once lighted from below, it might be out of the power of the executioner to abridge her torture. " Oh ! Rouen, Rouen ! " she cried, " am I then here to die ? I fear that thou wilt suffer through my death." This, then, was the deliverance which her *Voices* had promised her. Her confessor ascended the scaffold with her, comforting her and exhorting her. When she was bound to the stake, and the fire applied below, she uttered a cry ; but still, thoughtful for others rather than herself, she implored of her confessor, whose zeal made him still remain near her, to go down, as he might be in danger. She then said, " Whether I have done well or ill, my king is free from blame."

When the flames first touched her, she shuddered and asked for holy water ; but, as they gathered round her, she cried out, " My *Voices* have not deceived me—my *Voices* were from God." From that time forth she uttered no word except the name of that Saviour which she had once inscribed on her banner of victory, and with that holy name upon her lips she expired.

Her work was not the less accomplished. She said she had come to drive the English forth from France, and she did so. Their power continued to dwindle day by day. She said boldly on her trial that, before seven years should pass, the English would receive a greater blow than the fall of Orleans ; and in six years after that time King Charles entered Paris.

Professor Creasy has ranked the victory of Orleans alongside of Marathon and Waterloo, among the fifteen decisive battles of the world ; because by it France was saved, and her place preserved amongst the nations of Christendom. But it was not to save her country alone that the maiden of Orleans drew her unstained and consecrated sword—the only victor's sword which was never polluted by blood. " In another hundred years," says Professor O'Hagan, " came the great revolt against the Church, in which France, humanly speaking, held the balance, and it was not in the designs of Providence that she should be in that hour the servant of England."

That such a mission was worthy of the marvels with which it was accompanied, no Catholic can deny ; " almost every inquirer," says the same writer, " who has combined high intelligence with faith has come to avow himself a believer in

the truth of her Divine mission. Where the Church has not pronounced, each one is, of course, left to his private judgment upon the evidence. We may, if it so seems to us, conclude that all this wonder—this undeniable history of an unlettered child, who, in her obscure hamlet, not only declares herself commissioned from on High to deliver her country, but from the beginning details with luminous precision the means by which that deliverance was to be effected; who, in the accomplishment of her task, was enabled at once to recognize those whom she had never seen, and to reveal secrets known to no mortal; whose prophecies of future events are attested by evidence which defies doubt; and who, in the command of armies, showed the skill of a captain of thirty years' experience—that it is all explicable upon natural principles of enthusiasm and delusion. We may, if we are of the class that can repose contentedly in words and abstractions instead of realities, name her the impersonation of the soul of France, and even (*her* the most devoted to her king and to his nobles!) the herald of the triumph of democracy and of the rising of the Gaul against the Frank and Norman. We may recur for an explanation to the modern miracles of mesmerism and spiritualism. Or we may, upon the whole, deem it the simpler solution to say that, in a great crisis in which the whole future of the balanced commonwealth of Christian Europe, and with it the peace and freedom of the Church, were imperilled, the Arm which had of old sent forth a shepherd boy for the salvation of Israel was not shortened, and once more raised up the weak ones of this world to confound the strong. If Joan was not, as she averred, sent from God to save her perishing country, history has no such marvel and no such problem."

"*Heroine of Orleans*," are the concluding words of the panegyric pronounced by the Bishop of Edinburgh in the city which she set free. "*Heroine of Orleans*, be of good cheer; your mission has not failed, nor shall your victory be meted by the poor measurement of Charles VII. You have saved far more than France; and not without a mysterious meaning was Michael chosen to be your guide—Michael, whose voice was so familiar to you in the garden of Domremy; and who, from his neighbouring sanctuary, aided you in your death-struggle at Rouen,—Michael, the angel of the Church. You thought but of the misery of France; you saw her only with the eyes of your love. But the eye of God had long followed her in her sins; He struck her in His justice. And well was the punishment deserved by the accomplice of Philip the Fair, who dared to insult the throne of Peter, and to say to schism, 'I will be thy strength.' Yet a few short years, and the spouse of

Christ must undergo a new trial; and a far wider rent shall be made in the robe of her unity, and those who oppress you to-day shall no longer be called her children. But, thanks to your victories, their banners shall not then float on the towers of S. Denis; and, if the red hand of sanguinary revolution should seek to separate for ever her eldest daughter from the Church, the heirs of Edward and of Henry may indeed cast their sword into the balance, but they shall not burthen it with the weight of their sceptre, nor shall history have to tell the tale of Christendom, shaken to its base by the apostacy of France. Daughter of God! as your *Voices* named you, your victory has saved all Christian nations by preserving the faith of Clovis for your own. Drink now, like your Lord, the bitter chalice which God prepares for those whom He sends to redeem their brethren; and, as you embrace that cross of wood, which one of our soldiers has made for you, embrace your last glory, and receive the martyr's crown.

"The 10,000 men who stand gazing at the spectacle understand at last that they are witnessing the death agony of a saint, for from that temple of fire comes forth no sound, but words of pardon and of prayer.

"Suddenly a piercing cry cleaves the columns of smoke; it is the last revelation of Joan of Arc, her last cry upon earth—'JESUS,' and it is answered from heaven, '*Veni, veni, coronaberis!*'"*

* An able article, by M. Nettement, in the *Revue des Questions Historiques*, which has come into our hands since the above pages were written, strongly advocates that view of the mission of Joan of Arc which supposes it to have been fulfilled and concluded by the Coronation of Charles VII. at Rheims. The facts brought forward by M. Nettement seem to us to be equally consistent with the theory that her mission had a wider range, and that its full and immediate accomplishment was delayed by the sins and unfaithfulness of those with whom she acted, and for whom and by whose means she suffered. Her prediction of the liberation of the Duke of Orleans, and of the immediate expulsion of the English, could not have been more positive or more seemingly unconditional than the Prophet's threat against Nineve: "Yet three days, and Nineve shall be destroyed;" and yet, at the penitence of the king and people of that city, its coming destruction was averted. Why may not the impenitence and unbelief of Charles and his worldly counsellors have in like manner delayed the moment of the final deliverance which was in store for France, and which might otherwise have been effected by the triumph, and not by the martyrdom, of her virgin champion? It seems in the highest degree improbable that any motive short of obedience to a divine mission should have detained the pious and modest village girl in the midst of men at arms, and subjected her to the continued presence of sights and sounds, abhorrent to her essentially-womanly nature and saintly spirit. No bidding but from the voices which she had followed from Domremy would have stayed her from returning thither, had she believed that her task was accomplished at Rheims. From

that triumphal day those voices indeed spoke to her of little but trial and suffering, to end however in assured victory. M. Nettement thus reads, and reads we think aright, the mystery of those latter days of humiliation and defeat :—

“The voices had made two promises to Joan of Arc—that she should save France, and she did save it—that she should save her own soul, and that they would conduct her to Paradise. Now, was not the second part of the life of Joan of Arc, with her trials, her defeats, her captivity, her martyrdom, necessary to the salvation of Joan of Arc, as the victories of Joan of Arc, up to the time of the consecration at Rheims were necessary to the salvation of France? Assuredly we detest the injustice, the iniquity, and the base and pitiless cruelty of the English towards this holy and heroic maiden; but were not the counsels of vengeance and of fury excited by the defeats of Orleans and Patay a covering for the counsels of God’s mercy towards their victim? Did He not preserve her by this adversity, and these humiliations from that breath of pride which sometimes comes to tarnish the souls of those glorious creatures by whom the purposes of Heaven are accomplished, and which would destroy even the elect, if the elect could be destroyed? Was He not thus purifying her in the crucible of suffering? Was not the funeral pile at Rouen, which stands as her pedestal in history, a step which raised her nearer to Heaven? and was not this thought in her mind when she said, as she ascended it—“Where shall I be this night?” and added: “By the grace of God I shall be in Paradise. No, my *Voices* have not deceived me.”

We are glad to see a new work upon the *Life and Death of Jeanne d’Arc*, by Miss Harriet Parr, favourably noticed in the December No. of *The Month*. It has not yet come into our hands.

ART. VI.—THE DIRECTORIUM ANGLICANUM.

The Directorium Anglicanum. Third Edition. Edited by Rev. F. G. LEE, D.C.L. London: Bosworth.

THROUGH all her history the Church of God—whether primæval, patriarchal, Mosaic, or Christian—has employed in her solemn worship the two faculties given to man,—action as well as speech. The Scriptures, as the records of God's dealings with man, abound with examples—God showing Himself in action with regard to man, and man making a return of action on his part. The relation thus expressed, forms even a characteristic distinction between the Scriptures as a whole, and moral treatises, such as those of Confucius or Seneca. And to express it more vividly, Almighty God is represented in the Old Testament as acting in human shape and semblance; till at last this method of converse was perfected in the Incarnation. Nor was it then discontinued, as our Lord during His sojourn on earth frequently chose actions to express the workings of His divine power,—breathing on His disciples, laying hands on the sick, anointing the eyes of the blind, and the like.

To the mysteries thus expressed there is a counterpart in the action of man about the solemn worship of God. Sacrifices, oblations, bending the knees, prostrations, lifting up the hands on high, ablutions, circumcisions, from Abel the Just to John the Baptist, are the solemn acts and material symbols through which the whole body of religion is expressed. And our Lord, as He came not only displaying the power of God, but also “fulfilling all justice” as man, would neither overlook the language of action in the old system which was to be made perfect in Him, nor leave it out of the new system He was about to establish. The washing of baptism which He received and enjoined to be received, the sacred mysteries which He first celebrated and commanded His disciples to “do” in remembrance of Him, the washing His disciples' feet, the prostration of Himself in prayer in the garden, the offering Himself as a visible and terrible sacrifice, were all open actions of our High Priest in His humanity. Nor does He cease His action on leaving the earth; entering the highest heaven is but part of the perpetual action that began on the Cross. And

in such a form was He pleased to appear in the Apocalypse, whether as Priest clothed in a sacrificial garment, and standing before the golden altar, or as Victim before the Throne—in each the action being the same—the Everlasting Sacrifice.

The Apostles, although commissioned to impart new and startling truths, yet make the language of words but an introduction to sacred and mysterious actions, baptizing, imposing hands, breaking bread from house to house, blessing the chalice of benediction, or anointing the sick with oil. They are not merely preachers of the word, but are to be accounted as “dispensers of the mysteries of God;” the former being but a disposing and preparing of the soul for the more efficacious word conveyed by the latter.

This sacramental and sacrificial action became clothed with ceremony by its very nature, by its very dignity and sacredness, and even as the result of the secrecy it demanded, and the persecution to which it led. Ceremonial took as a matter of course a fixed and regulated form, and thus became rubrical; till in time even the minor details of ceremonial observance became regulated by authority, lest diversity in them should introduce confusion into the whole of the sacred rite.

The vision of the Heavenly Kingdom in the Apocalypse is undoubtedly portrayed under the similitude of the ceremony of the Christian Church as employed in the Holy Sacrifice. The most ancient records extant clearly point out a similar arrangement of personages with other accessories,—the Throne in the middle of a circle of seats, the Altar, the lights, and the incense. The oldest liturgies, both of East and West, are traced up to the Apostles. And the eight modes of the ecclesiastical chant have even an earlier origin, there being considerable evidence to connect them with the services of the Temple at Jerusalem. Thus all monuments of the Church from the beginning unite in showing that the liturgical worship or sacrificial action was always the central part of Divine service; and that at the time of the outbreak of the Reformation heresies, the liturgy and ceremonial were in substance and general features the same as they had been from the first.

Those heresies rejected the Eucharistic sacrifice, and denied, more or less, the Catholic doctrine of the Sacraments; while exalting the ministry of the preacher to the exclusion of everything beyond the barest sacramental forms. Almighty God prescribed two modes for man to exercise religion; and man has accordingly devoted himself in both those modes from the day when Abel offered sacrifice to the ten thousand masses this morning celebrated all over the world,—namely, that of vocal

prayer and preaching, and that of liturgical action. But of these two modes, Protestantism has superexalted the one, and, as far as possible, discarded the other. Protestantism has treated man as if he had little more than one sense and one organ, and has introduced a service of God that lies almost wholly between the lips of one man and the ears of his fellows. Protestantism has thus set its ban upon the genius of the worship of all ages, in which the whole man, body and soul, with all his senses and faculties combined in one united harmony of action and supplication to worship God and edify his neighbour.

Against this cold, narrow, insipid, and half-hearted scheme of religion, by which public worship has been contracted into the forms of domestic piety; against this unscriptural, unpatristic, mere philosophic style of serving God with nothing more than "the sacrifice of the lips," a reaction has come about, of which we as yet see but the beginnings. It is not for us here to investigate the causes of this reaction, but undoubtedly it indicates the growth of a larger and keener sense of what the soul needs, and a deeper instinct of what God and the Christian Faith demand of us. The new wine of a new spirit is fermenting in skins that have long been dry and musty. Men are looking to the old paths and asking for the ancient ways, and are coming to the discovery that they have been under the domination of a cruel stepmother, who has not only kept them on scanty fare, but has industriously concealed from them the nobleness of their ancestry, and the rich inheritance that has been diverted from them.

The study of Catholic writings, old and new, and the transference into our language of Catholic truth, however defectively accomplished, has revived the love of great truths and venerable mysteries that had long been lost sight of. Catholic solemnities witnessed either at home or on the Continent, and the study of Catholic Liturgies, have opened many eyes to see the nakedness and poverty of the Protestant services. Knowledge thus revived, imperfect and broken though it be, has yet had force enough to stir the hearts of many, and to take shape and action. A result, and not the least remarkable, is seen in the volume, the title of which stands at the head of this article,—"*The Directorium Anglicanum*,"—a book which has already attained notoriety through other channels. It is a manual for the direction of the Anglican clergy in conducting their services; in the shape of a commentary on the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, attempting to systematize and expand those vague and scanty formularies, and to defend, as consistent with them, the practices usually termed "the Ritualistic Movement."

We can at least accord the compilers the praise of boldness and ingenuity; since it is no less than an endeavour to convert the Anglican Order of Communion into a Catholic Mass, and to bring the other "Orders" and "Forms" in that book into conformity with the Breviary, the Ritual, the Pontifical, and even the *Cæremoniale Episcoporum*.

The cast of the book is one to provoke a smile even from a Catholic child, to say nothing of the amusement, which but for the seriousness of the event, and the gravity of the subject, it must awaken in any well-instructed person. For it is an effort to solve a very old problem in a very new way,—to pour the contents of the hog'shead into the pint measure, or to squeeze a giant into the skin of a dwarf. Nor would this be more absurd than affecting to force the whole action and ceremonial of the Roman Ritual books into the shreds of rubric of the Book of Common Prayer.

We may give the compilers credit for seeing the error which has made the preacher the centre of attraction in the Church, and for putting forward forcibly the idea of a distinct object towards which the devotion of the worshipper should be directed, as well as of public worship being a real action, and not a mere dialogue between parson and clerk. But, with a purpose so noble, and ideas so calculated to elevate the mind, which are enforced in the First Preface in language befitting the dignity of the subject, it is painful to find such a change of tone in the Preface to the Third Edition. The style there, only too much like what is sometimes found in the *Union Review*, runs into what may be called slang polemics. The writer allows himself to adopt the modes of his opponents, to return their smart hits in kind, and to treat his subject more in the way of a party defence of a Reform Bill than as the apologist of a system which, whether received or rejected, ought to be a matter of conscience to all concerned.

And while the compilers profess their wish to revive the right idea of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and to cultivate the decency and even splendour of Divine worship, they are careful not to make too marked a profession of their belief. Apparently the book is intended to be used by persons of different ways of belief, or entertaining different "views" with regard to the Holy Mysteries; for in a note on the first page, "the word 'mass' is stated to have no connection with the doctrine of transubstantiation," while elsewhere that term is used approvingly.

While, then, the system of this work seems to be a ceremonial without a Theology,—a worship without a defined and dogmatic faith,—it is difficult to understand the state of mind of its

compilers. Between Acts of Parliament, the Prayer-book of 1549 and that of 1662, the ancient Canon Law and modern Anglican usage, the Sarum and Roman rites, it is difficult to say what authority they recognize. What master do they serve? Can they give a true allegiance to all these at once? And if not, which is the final referee they submit to? Is it their own selves—the compilers, as speaking for “our Church,”—or do they leave it to each individual clergyman? And can they thus even be acting in thoroughly good faith with themselves?

We know the position of a Catholic priest. He has to make a conscience of obeying the rubric. He will find an authority to call him to account if he does not, and a guide to instruct him if in doubt. He inherits a living tradition, and follows a system taught by living guides.

But the compilers of this work, seeing the defects of their own Prayer-book, cast about to supply them. If, then, we try to put ourselves in their position, we may believe the mental process to be some such as the following. They first consider themselves entitled to appropriate every Catholic practice, of the use of which any instance can be shown in the Anglican Church since the Reformation—no matter whether by any authority, nor whether the motive of its use be religious or not—thus dragging in the full observance of the Feast of Corpus Christi, besides several others, because those days are marked by certain titles in the Stationers’ or other almanacs. They are, perhaps, not far wrong in believing the ancient Canon Law to be still in force; but then, they make no exception in cases where its precepts are at variance with the doctrine, and still more with the spirit of their Prayer-book. And, having gained such a step, they proceed therefrom boldly to resuscitate the Sarum rite. This, however, is a feat beyond their power. It is impossible to reanimate a defunct system. It will not live again. It is dead. “There is no voice, nor any to answer.” The prophet’s staff may be laid on the lifeless frame, but no prophet is at hand to call it back to life.

We must sorrowfully admit that they seem to prefer appealing to any authority rather than that of the living voice of the Church. Though the Sarum rite is derived from the Roman, they prefer to ignore the latter as far as possible, and to quote the former as the observance of “our Church.” But it happens not seldom that the Sarum rubric is inapplicable, or not sufficiently explicit; and then—for we cannot call them wanting in assurance—they refer to Roman authorities as the practice of the Western Church.

In the earliest days of the Church, we read that “a great

multitude of priests obeyed the faith." Thus obedience was the spirit and disposition in which the faith was to be received even by those appointed to teach the law and guide others. And the work before us so far acknowledges this principle as to speak of "a scrupulous ritualist."* But what can be the law they make to themselves when they comply with that of their own Church only by stretching it to the utmost,—take up with another and an abrogated system only so far as it suits their own convenience; and, finally, acknowledge the guidance of the Catholic Church, but only far enough to run into peril by an approach within hearing, and then refusing to hearken to her call?

What theory of conscience can a person have who, professing himself to be a priest, undertakes to bless the Holy Oils,—a function that has always been reserved to bishops in the Western Church? What faith can he have in such a blessing? If he professes to act as a priest of the Western Church, what pretence is there for saying that the right to give this blessing "reverts to the priest as inherently within his province"? †

If we now proceed to the details of the work, we find some directions absolutely childish; such as that "it might be expedient to use white wine on ferial days, and red on festivals." ‡ And others enter into points so minute, that the observance of them would be a burden, and would tend only to entangle the conscience, instead of assisting devotion.

It is remarkable that accuracy has so far been attained in general, a result that evinces much patient research. But to show the difficulty, or even the impossibility of entering into the spirit of a traditional system merely from books, we will quote a few instances of errors of fact or principle, though by no means all that might be given. Thus we read of "rinsing the chalice after the purifications," § which should only be done in case of necessity, perhaps once in the course of twelve months. Again, the "offertory basin is to be placed on the altar by the priest." || This is in accordance with the Common Prayer Book, and perhaps the custom was derived from the ancient usage of offering bread and wine for the altar. But it is not right that anything should be placed on the altar that is not used in the sacrifice. Further on is a recommendation of a "white *moleskin* chasuble, with orphreys of *scarlet cloth*;" ¶ though the only materials permitted to be used for vestments are silk, velvet, and gold or silver tissue. The Editor seems himself in doubt, for he quotes an authority in a

* Page 52.

§ Page 10.

† Page 305.

|| Page 11.

‡ Page 242.

¶ Page 23.

note, "Item, one Awter cloth of *white fustyan* with red roses, with a crucifix;" the italics being his own, and not knowing that an antependium, as this must have been, is not a vestment. Afterwards comes the direction, "it would be proper to say the collects of commemorated feasts at both the Holy Communion and the ordinary office; but the head collects of seasons,—viz., Advent and Lent, at Holy Communion only;"* though the commemoration of those days, the *Feriae majores*, is always to be made both in the Divine Office and the Mass.

The glossary at the end seems to have been drawn up by a different hand from the rest of the work; as there are discrepancies between them, and some errors in the glossary are even more glaring; for instance, the *Cappa Magna* is explained as "a cope with richer orphreys than the ferial one;"† whereas it is really a habit of silk with a long train and an ermine cape, peculiar to Bishops and Cardinals; and of Chrism it is said, "we do not use it except for the sick,"‡ though in another page the Chrism is rightly distinguished from the Holy Oil of the sick.§

We cannot overlook an error of doctrine that is found almost in the first line, where it is said, "the celebration of the Holy Eucharist . . . calls directly into action the office of our great High Priest, not only to present our prayers to the Father, but to plead anew the merits of His own adorable sacrifice."|| Our Blessed Lord's office cannot be called into action, because His sacrifice is perpetual. He is "High Priest for ever,"—not only in duration of the office, but also in continuity of action. He is "always living to make intercession for us." The Priest in the Mass offers Christ as a visible sacrifice, and thus communicates and applies to us the Adorable Sacrifice that was consummated on the Cross, and is ever being presented in heaven. But he cannot be said to "call directly into action" what is never intermitted.

There is a more serious charge to be made against the compilers of this work, on account of the attempts to excuse heterodox practices in the Anglican Church by alleged parallels in the ancient rite.

Such is, the trying to find a precedent in ancient usage for the rehearsal of the Ten Commandments; and the putting the response made after each Commandment on a level with the *Kyrie Eleison* of the Mass.¶ This was too much even for the

* Page 52.

† Page 352.

‡ Page 353.

§ Page 356.

|| Pp. 1-2.

¶ Page 467.

present editor, who gives it up as "a singular and grievous innovation."

Such again is pretending to call the "Prayer for the Church Militant," "a Commemoration of the Living and Dead;"* when they know that the real commemoration of the Faithful departed was struck out, and never restored in the sense which that title implies.

Still more violent is the attempt to defend the rubric which directs that, in case of one species being all consumed in the Communion, more is to be consecrated. The words of the rubric are, "If the consecrated bread or wine be all spent before all have communicated, the Priest is to consecrate more according to the form before prescribed." Now on this the compilers say, "The rubric is a perfectly correct and simple transcript of the old Sarum rule in the *Cautelæ Missæ*,—that if a priest found there was no wine in the cup, after he had consecrated the bread, he was to begin at *Simili modo*, the previous part of the office *reckoning*. So with the bread, if a priest died, or fainted, in the act of consecrating it, another priest was to take up the rite at *Qui pridie*. What this proves is, that *unoblated* elements might be consecrated, the previous *oblation counting*. The whole of this old provision is in some measure a justification of ours."† How they can venture to urge such an excuse passes our understanding. They could scarcely fail to see that the object of the Church in her various provisions of the rubric is to secure the completion of the Sacrifice when once begun. To insure this end, everything else is to give way,—rubrics, laws of the Church, and the very Canon of the Mass, so far as unfinished. It is true that, if a priest died or fainted after or in the act of consecration, another priest is to complete what the first has begun, even if he be not fasting. Or in case of imminent danger, from earthquake, flood, fire, or irruption of enemies, the priest may proceed at once to the Communion, and having received the sacred species, may omit all the rest. How often this rubric must have been acted upon in this country during the times of persecution, when the pursuivants came breaking in during the celebration, it is impossible to say. But here is no parallel whatever for the case contemplated in the Anglican rubric. There, if the Anglican clergy were really priests, the sacrifice has been already completed, and the minister is directed to do what in fact would be to celebrate again, but consecrating only in one kind. It would be no less than sacrilege. And such a crime was certainly the result of the

* Page 66.

† Page 82.

rubric in its first introduction; for it first came as an adjunct to the Mass itself. It was introduced in the "Order of Communion," which was the first work of innovation under Edward VI., and was the new form of communicating the people after the celebration of Mass according to Catholic usage. It followed from the heretical Lutheran tenet that the Holy Eucharist is not a true sacrifice, but only a communion; and thus the communion of the people is made the end to be attained, and not, as in the Catholic rubric, the completion of the sacrifice. It is a remarkable instance of the mode in which, when people rise in rebellion against the Church, they involve themselves in greater difficulties than those which they put forward as the excuse for their defection; for the very innovation which was to give the people communion in both kinds, allowed, and even necessitated, a sacrilegious consecration in one kind only.

Our limits prevent our quoting other instances of excuses made, which we cannot admit as genuine, and in which the shifts and devices resorted to would be laughable if the object they are meant to cover were not so serious.

An Anglican minister of "extreme" views—now a Catholic priest—was once consulted as to the expediency of collecting and publishing authorities for, and examples of, Catholic practices in the Anglican Church, and his reply was that he feared the result would be "a gaunt Anglicanism." His instinct told him truly, and the result he feared has come to pass.

We cannot but feel uneasy for those who adopt the principles of this work, and for those who follow their guidance. Our fear is, that some of them at least make strained excuses to themselves, either for adopting practices to which they have not been used, or for admitting and sanctioning other things that are part of the system they are in,—that they know in their inmost hearts that these excuses are strained, and that thus they are acting in doubt, and are making themselves a false conscience. Here is a work which treats of the Holy Sacrifice, the Real Presence, the Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament in terms of Catholic faith and piety; yet the compilers not only remain in the same communion with those who deny such a faith and denounce their practices, but even in this very work leave it an open question whether practices inconsistent with this belief are to be done or not. What, then, can be their own belief? Does not their work wear the appearance of playing with sacred things?

We shall watch with interest and anxiety the further development of this strange movement. Meantime, as the principle of Protestantism is private judgment in religion

both in belief and practice, a right to choose the authorities to be followed, and to follow them only so far as it suits a person's own will, we part under the impression that there are no greater Protestants in the Established Church than the compilers and editors of the "Directorium Anglicanum."

ART. VII.—TWO CRITICISMS ON THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

The Dublin Review. New Series : Nos. I.-XIV.

WHEN we started the New Series of this Review, we issued no kind of prospectus; and now also we are in some sense ashamed to detain the reader, even for a few pages, on a matter personal to ourselves. But we are told of two criticisms as very frequently made on this REVIEW, which show so complete a misapprehension—the one of our plan, the other of our principles,—that after much deliberation we have thought it better expressly to notice them.

Firstly then, we have received of late more than one friendly but urgent remonstrance, on what is considered the undue preponderance given by us to Theology. We feel the most sincere respect for many of our kind critics; and as we cannot show that respect by adopting their suggestion, we are the more anxious to show it by giving our reasons for dissent. Our simplest course then will be to explain distinctly what are the objects at which we have aimed throughout. For certainly if we had made any profession of treating, *on their own ground*, the various branches of secular science and literature, the execution of our plan would have been a most undeniable and signal failure. But then we never made the slightest profession of the kind. Is every periodical to write about everything? or may not an editor choose one particular class of subjects, and abstain from troubling his head about others? The latter certainly has been our own conception. We are most strongly of opinion that it is the one most likely to issue in important service; but we state a simple matter of fact in saying, that it is the only one which the present editor would find practicable.

In truth, the ends at which we have aimed have been such as the following; and we shall be surprised if any one calls them narrow and paltry. To assist our readers, so far as our humble position and opportunity may permit, in grasping

those great Objects of Faith which are to be man's light during his pilgrimage: in sympathizing with sanctity, and detesting worldliness under its various disguises of naturalism, nationalism, and intellectualism: in apprehending the Church's full prerogatives and authority: in understanding her past history: in being proof against the shameful misrepresentations everywhere prevalent concerning that history: in rendering most unreserved loyalty and homage to the Holy See: in recognizing the infallibility of that See in its widest and fullest extent: in discerning the true position of the rock of Rome amidst the ocean of modern European politics: in appreciating the character and basis of Christian civilization: in abhorring the Revolution and its principles: in seeing through the sophisms of anti-Christian and anti-Catholic philosophy: in realizing the frightful evils of mixed education, whether to the lower or (still more emphatically) to the higher classes: in estimating the various secular questions of the day, according to the true and high Catholic standard; as God estimates them; as the Church teaches her children to regard them.

Of this kind is the course proposed by the Holy Father to a Catholic journalist, in his brief on the *Civiltà*; * of this kind is the course which we have ourselves attempted to follow. Such ends by no means exclude a treatment of secular subjects; on the contrary, they absolutely require such treatment: but undoubtedly they determine its limits and its method. We hope henceforth, as hitherto, to present our readers with a fair proportion of such matter; only our selection of it will always mainly depend on its connection with religion. We by no means confine ourselves—like a purely theological Review—to the science of Theology; and yet this *is* the only science which we handle for its own sake. No portion of the secular field is external to our plans, so far as it has any bearing on the principles of Catholic morality; on the interests of the Church; on the salvation of souls. But on the other hand, secular science and literature *in itself*,—and so far as it has

* "We did not fail again and again to urge men . . . that, principally under the guidance each man of his own bishop, they should by their writings defend our august religion, refute its assailants, detect, expose, overthrow so many monstrous prodigies of their opinions, and enlighten with truth especially the minds of unwary men and of inexperienced youth. . . .

"In order that there should ever be certain appointed men who, being heartily devoted to Us and to this Chair of Peter, and eminent for their love of Our most holy religion, and celebrated for sound and solid doctrine and erudition, may be able to fight the good fight, and by their writings to defend unintermittingly Catholic interests and sound doctrine, and to vindicate the same from the fallacies, injustices, and errors of opponents," &c. &c. &c.

See the whole Brief, in our number for last July, pp. 229-233.

no relation to faith and morals,—is excluded from our design. Of course from time to time we may fill up a gap with such neutral and harmless matter as presents itself at the moment; but our *choice* of subjects lies wholly in the above-named direction.

Now we are undoubtedly filled with shame on looking back at the career of this REVIEW, under its present editorship; but for a very different reason from that which our critics would suggest. We are ashamed of the deplorable inadequacy, with which we have performed so noble and so sacred a task; and we feel deeply, that to succeed in it at all satisfactorily, would require the highest and most concentrated energies of many minds of the very highest order. This, then, is the answer we would give to those friendly counsellors who wish us to extend our range. Our present enterprise by itself is too momentous and too arduous for our power; to avoid ignominious failure therein, we must give it our exclusive attention; to aim at more would be simply to break down. And at last, why should we *wish* to aim at more? Our large and increasing circulation is a complete proof that the number of Catholics is by no means inconsiderable, who are interested in what we offer them. Why are we to be more remiss in a work of considerable moment, on which we have been hitherto engaged;—in order to enter on one totally different, of greatly inferior importance, and for which we have neither inclination nor capacity?

Even while concentrating our energies on one field, we have failed deplorably in its due cultivation. There are two subjects in particular, on which we have been signally deficient. We have hitherto said nothing, or almost nothing, to meet the various objections brought in these days against dogmatic and revealed religion, on moral grounds; on grounds of history; on grounds of physical science. And we have been almost silent on those vitally momentous questions, which may be comprised under the general name, “interests of the Catholic poor.” It has been a great consolation to us under our shortcomings in this latter respect, to find such excellent service done by our admirable and invaluable contemporary, *The Month*. No words of acknowledgement and gratitude can be too strong for its successive papers on workhouses, prisons, and now on Protestant proselytism in Ireland. We entreat those few of our readers who have not already done so, to procure *The Month* for March, April, May, and December, 1866; and lay practically to heart the facts they will see there set forth. May God bless and reward the writer for his pious labour! And returning to the DUBLIN REVIEW, it will be

inferred from our remarks, that if we were able to obtain satisfactory contributions on the two particulars above mentioned, we would gladly assign to them a large and prominent place; so that (to this extent at least) our secular matter may possibly hereafter occupy even a less proportion of our pages than it has hitherto done.

Such then, in brief, is our plan. Whether a greater or less proportion of things secular shall be found in any given number, is a matter more or less of accident. But that things secular shall be treated, so far as possible, exclusively in their relation to things spiritual, this is our very aim and endeavour.

The second criticism of which we have heard is, that our tone is too peremptory and overbearing; that we erect our own private opinion into a kind of shibboleth (as it has been expressed to us); and that we speak of those who oppose our own private views, just as though they opposed the Church's authoritative teaching. We really do not think that this criticism would have been made, unless objectors had confused in their mind two questions most absolutely and entirely distinct. It is a most intelligible charge, *e.g.*, to say that we stretch the Church's infallibility a great deal too far; and it is a most intelligible charge to say that we are peremptory and overbearing, on questions which we admit to be open. But the two charges are as distinct from each other, as a charge of forgery from one of burglary. Let us consider them successively.

Do we, then, stretch too far the Church's infallibility? We will begin with one particular on which we have spoken a good deal. There is a large body of teaching contained in Papal Allocutions, Encyclicals, and the like, which have been accepted (as in this day all such documents always are) by the Catholic Episcopate. We have carefully distinguished indeed (see *e.g.* Jan. 1865, p. 51) this actual *teaching* on one hand from *arguments, obiter dicta, &c.*, on the other hand. But we have consistently maintained (1) that this body of teaching is infallibly true, and (2) that the contradictory opinion is unsound, censurable, condemned by the Church. Certainly—considering that some Catholics, both in England and Germany, *avow* this contradictory opinion—we *should* have pursued a peremptory and overbearing course, had we *assumed* our thesis to be correct without giving any grounds for the opinion. But we entered at great length on those grounds; and, to facilitate reference, Dr. Ward collected all the relevant matter into one volume. Liberals emphatically profess to go by reason; and we really indulged the hope that they would attempt to grapple with our

reasoning. Fond delusion ! They have shrunk from the field of fair and open argument, and betaken themselves to the easy and ready path of declamation and invective. If *their* procedure had been called "peremptory and overbearing," we could have understood what was meant ; but how such terms can be applied to ourselves in this matter, it baffles us to conjecture.

A second thesis, advocated by us, has been that the Church is infallible (to use the language of theologians) not as "testis" only, but as "judex" and "magistra." In other words, we have maintained that her practical no less than her formal teaching is to be accepted as the Voice of God ; and that the contradictory opinion is unsound and censurable. We entered into this matter at considerable length last April, pp. 421-438 ; but in this, as in the former case, there has been no attempt to answer our argument. Which line of conduct is justly considered "peremptory and overbearing" ? That of *giving reasons* for one's intellectual position, or of *refusing* to give them ?

A third thesis of ours has been, that the Church authoritatively and infallibly condemns what many Protestants call the principle of religious liberty ; or, in other words, the tenet that a State exceeds its jurisdiction in refusing toleration to religious error. Here, again, we have not based the statement on our own "*ipse dixit*." We have argued at length that the "*Mirari vos*" (January, 1865, pp. 58-66) and the "*Quantâ curâ*," with its appended Syllabus (April, 1865, pp. 487-492), indubitably establish our thesis. At the same time, we have been most careful on every occasion to argue, that the Church has never censured Catholic rulers for giving the fullest religious liberty to every hereditary Protestant sect, even in a country where Catholics are numerically very preponderant ; and, moreover, that Catholics of the present day are unanimous in favour of such liberty being granted. We have only explained, in harmony with the Church's teaching, that that is a far higher and happier state of things, in which the whole people is Catholic ; and in which the introduction of any non-Catholic worship is stringently forbidden. We have given at length, we say, our reasons for so interpreting the Church's language ; while, as to those who accuse us of "peremptory and overbearing temper," not one of them has even attempted (so far as we know) to give it any different explanation.

And, to give another final instance, we have designated as a condemned error the opinion, that scholastic theology is no longer suitable to the Church's needs. But really on this matter the 13th proposition of the Syllabus is so very explicit, that no second interpretation is even imaginable.

Now, on these respective theses and such as these, we should be utterly ashamed of ourselves if we had ever so written, as to imply that the contradictory tenets can be lawfully held by a Catholic. We have felt it a sacred duty, whenever we have mentioned these theses, to indicate by our tone that whoever contradicts them (however excellent his character and his motives) is in real truth uttering unsound doctrine and, rebelling against the Church's authority. If *this* be what is called "peremptory and overbearing" — never to treat a denial of the Church's doctrine in any other tone than that of confident reprobation—we sincerely hope, by God's grace, we shall always continue to deserve the charge.

It may be said, perhaps, that Christian prudence and moderation require a writer to consider, not merely whether what he says is true; nor even whether it has been sealed by the Church's infallible impress: but also whether its inculcation at this particular time be conducive to the Church's benefit. A peremptory and overbearing spirit may be displayed, not only in pressing as certain a doubtful doctrine, but also in pressing unwisely and unseasonably a doctrine which is certain. We think this opinion so undeniably true and so very important, that we entreat the reader's careful attention to a somewhat long extract, in which we have treated it. After arguing last April against Dr. Pusey's projects of union, one of our concluding remarks was the following:—

An Unionist [we said] may address to us the following objection:—"You have admitted, after all, in this very article, that truth is not *invariably* to be placed before peace; you have admitted that this or that doctrine—even though infallibly sanctioned by the Church—may yet under peculiar circumstances be legitimately waived and put into abeyance, for the sake of Christian harmony. But in admitting this, you emphatically condemn the course undeviatingly pursued by you gentlemen of the DUBLIN REVIEW. Let me take two tenets, which you have been forward in advocating: viz. (1) The infallibility of Papal Encyclicals or Allocutions; and (2) the legitimacy and advisableness, in certain countries, of the Catholic ruler refusing civil toleration to heretics. You will certainly admit that no tenets can tend more powerfully than these to inflame differences and exasperate spirits. Let me grant, then, for argument's sake (what in fact I totally deny) that these tenets are true; yet, have you not been arguing, in this very article, that the Church will often, under circumstances, forbear from insisting on what she regards as true, that Christian unity may be the better promoted? From your own mouths we judge you, reckless and mischievous firebrands that you are."

Such an objection may have occurred to many readers: it undoubtedly requires an answer, and we will express our answer with the utmost frankness. But we must first state our own principle somewhat more distinctly.

There is a large body of truths, taught by God to the Apostles, and proposed by the Church as having been thus taught. These constitute the Deposit of Faith; and they are earnestly inculcated by the Church, in all places and under all circumstances. There is further a large body of doctrines, infallibly determined by the Church, which are intimately connected indeed with the Deposit, but are no integral part thereof. In regard to any one of these doctrines, there is a possibility, we admit, that under particular circumstances more harm than good may be done by its prominent exhibition. Supposing, therefore, a Catholic is called to account for bringing forward tenets, which cause public prejudice against the Church;—*he gives no sufficient answer to the charge, by proving that these tenets are true; or even that the Church has infallibly sanctioned them*: he was bound also to consider whether their enforcement at this particular moment were according to the rules of Christian prudence.

Now, this very principle is urged against us to our condemnation. But let our readers carefully observe the qualification with which we have invariably accompanied it. Under particular circumstances, no doubt, the interests of the Church and of the Faith are better promoted by waiving some indubitable doctrine than by insisting on it. *But who is to judge on the existence of such circumstances?* We answer emphatically, the Church. The problem involved is so complex and intricate that no individual can, without the wildest presumption, dream of solving it for himself. It is the Church, enlightened by the Holy Spirit, which alone is competent to point out the true course. We are speaking throughout, as above explained, not on the dogmata of faith, but on other doctrines connected with those dogmata. And just as it is to the Church alone that we look when we desire to know which of these doctrines are infallibly true;—so it is to the Church alone that we look when we desire to know which of these doctrines, *being* infallibly true, should, under particular circumstances, be prominently and urgently enforced.

Here, then, is our vindication. We have laid earnest stress on the two tenets named above by our imaginary opponent. Why have we laid on them such earnest stress? Not through any trust in our own private judgment but because the Church herself called on us so to do; because in these times a Catholic writer would have disloyally failed in his allegiance, had he acted otherwise. For several years past the Holy Father has been energetically summoning all Catholics to hold interiorly a certain doctrine on his civil principedom. But this doctrine neither is, nor possibly can be, defined as of faith; he has therefore been energetically summoning all Catholics to hold interiorly a certain doctrine which is not of faith. It is the Pope himself, then, “the vicegerent of Christ,” “the teacher of Christians,” who has summoned Catholic writers to vindicate the due authority of those doctrinal determinations which are not definitions of faith. Nor has he been less emphatic [of late], whether by word or action, in denouncing that anti-Catholic principle, called “liberty of conscience,” which he and his predecessors have so often condemned under its various shapes. The “*Mirari vos*”—the recent Encyclical and Syllabus—use expressions quite as strong as any which we have employed; or rather considerably stronger. *It has been our*

one wish, our highest ambition, to follow humbly his authoritative guidance,—not only as to what doctrines we shall believe, but also as to what doctrines we shall urgently proclaim and vindicate.

So much, then, in regard to those theses which the Church has infallibly taught. But there are various other opinions which we have earnestly maintained; opinions from which the best Catholics may most widely dissent. Have we been peremptory and overbearing in our mode of advocating *these*? We will not confidently assert the negative; but we will at least say that we have been constantly on our guard against the danger, and that we really doubt whether we have transgressed the bounds of tolerance and moderation. At all events we promise beforehand that, if any instance is shown of such transgression, we will publicly express repentance for our offence.

Two instances occur to us at the moment of open questions, on which articles have appeared; and on which both the respective writers and the editor have entertained extremely strong personal convictions. One of these is public school education: concerning which the editor feels intensely; for he spent the six unhappiest years of his life under a system, which (so far as his own bitter experience goes) he considers unmixedly demoralizing and hateful. A second is what may be called the negro question. That feeling towards the negro which prevails at this moment among very many Englishmen—a curious reaction from earlier excess on the opposite side—is, in our humble opinion, a very serious ethical disease and calamity. It is one, we think, which calls loudly for the animadversion of any periodical, which desires to promote true Catholic doctrine concerning the rights of our fellow-men and the claims of our co-redeemed. From this point of view we have considered in various articles both the American conflict and the Jamaican disturbances: our main interest in both these events having been our profound dislike of a certain anti-negro fanaticism, which seems to us just now dominant among some classes of Englishmen. These two instances may, perhaps, be taken as tests of the general spirit in which we have written. We ask, have we in either of them offended against due Christian moderation? While arguing earnestly for our own convictions, have we implied ever so distantly any disparaging remark against those Catholics, who might differ from us ever so extremely? We really believe that nothing of the kind will even be alleged.

Then, again, to take another illustration. While the Church has always protested most emphatically against the principle

of mixed education (see *e. g.* prop. 48 of the Syllabus *), it was for some time an open question in England, whether the proposal of a Catholic college at Oxford were or were not consistent with the Church's doctrine. During that period (October, 1864) we argued most earnestly against the proposal. Whoever reads our article will see that we spoke throughout with the greatest respect of the writer to whom we were replying; though we certainly thought, and think, that English Catholics were then threatened with a more formidable danger than has impended since the days of Milner and C. Butler.

We must repeat our apologies for having brought these personal matters before the reader's attention. But we wish, of course, to do the Church the best service in our power, be that power great or small. And it is plain that we should be grievously impaired in every effort of the kind, if such misconceptions prevailed as it has been the purpose of our present article to remove.

ART. VIII. — DR. McCOSH'S "INTUITIONS OF THE MIND" AND "EXAMINATION OF MILL'S PHILOSOPHY."†

[The writer of the following paper is of the ontologistic school. A previous contribution of his appeared in our number for October, 1865; and we explained on that occasion that this REVIEW is by no means committed to the particular school in question. We are not then responsible for the ensuing remarks on Dr. McCosh, but only for the opinion that they contain nothing which a Catholic has not the fullest right to hold, if it commends itself to his judgment.]

THERE are few writers upon metaphysics, in England or in Scotland, whose names are in any way upon a par with that of the author of the two works at the head of this paper. On many great and important points‡ he differs as widely from Sir W. Hamilton as he does from Mr. Mill, and yet the acknowledged inheritor of Sir William's mantle, Dr.

* "That method of instructing youth can be approved by Catholic men, which is disjoined from the Catholic Faith and the Church's power; and which regards exclusively, or at least principally, knowledge of the natural order alone, and the ends of social life on earth."

† *The Intuitions of the Mind inductively investigated*. Second and revised edition. By the Rev. JAMES McCOSH, LL.D., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in Queen's College, Belfast. London: Macmillan & Co., 1865.

An Examination of Mr. J. S. Mill's Philosophy, being a Defence of Fundamental Truth. By the same Author. 1866.

‡ *E. g.*, the doctrine of the relativity of knowledge. See "Method of the Divine Government," &c., p. 540.

Mansel, can scarcely ever quote from his writings without prefacing his extract with a complimentary phrase to the "distinguished Christian philosopher of the present day."*

Dr. McCosh was born in Ayrshire, in the year 1801. He was educated at the Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh. In 1850 he brought out a large work, over 600 pages octavo, on "The Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral," which, notwithstanding numerous passages of marked ability and even rare originality, is upon the whole rather heavy. It has, however, reached an eighth edition. Two or three of the dissertations which form the Appendix having a direct metaphysical bearing, will probably, when taken in connection with the works under review, call for some passing word of inquiry or comment. In 1851 he received his appointment to the post which, with great honour to himself and great advantage to his pupils, he has since held; and, in 1856, in conjunction with Dr. Dickie, Professor of Natural History in Queen's College, he published the "Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation," a work which has run through two editions, and is now out of print. Between the date of the publication of the "Intuitions" and of the "Examination," &c., he wrote a treatise on the "Supernatural in Relation to the Natural," which may, as he tells us in his preface thereto, be regarded as Part First of a work on the "Method of the Divine Government, Supernatural and Spiritual," which he intended should follow the "Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral." Like the treatise that preceded it, there is nothing to call forth any special remark in a paper such as this, upon metaphysics, with the exception of Article I. of the Appendix, which exhibits very clearly the baneful influence which the Hamiltonian "Nescience," elaborated by Mansel and pushed to its final consequence by Mill, has exerted upon Oxford philosophy.

As a metaphysician, it is by the "Intuitions of the Mind" that Dr. McCosh must stand or fall, and yet its publication is posterior in date to Dr. Mansel's eulogy of the writer. The "Examination of Mr. Mill's Philosophy" is but a special application of the writer's theory of fundamental truth as elaborated in the "Intuitions," to the refutation of Mill's basis of attack upon Sir William Hamilton. Hence a due appreciation of it, whether for agreement or disagreement, must necessarily be consequent upon a thorough understanding of the larger and previous work. It is obvious, therefore, that the "Intuitions of the Mind" should come first under

* "Limits of Religious Thought," p. 192.

notice, and that the "Examination &c." should be dealt with subsequently.

The preface to the first of these contains as clear a statement as can be met with, or even desired, of the two grand opposing problems of metaphysical science. The author has a very vivid perception, and gives a very lucid account, of the precise points of difference between the two adverse schools of thought. And though professing to apply induction to philosophy, he expresses himself most forcibly against those experimentalists or sensationalists who hold that the *scibile* has its basis or origin in the *sensible*, or, in other words, who maintain that the mind derives all its knowledge from observation and experience. "I would as soon," he says, "believe that there are no such agents as heat, chemical affinity, and electricity in physical nature, as that there are no immediate perceptions and native-born convictions in this mind of ours. I look, indeed, upon the one kind of agents, like the other, to be among the deepest and most potent at work in this world, mental and material; and the one class, like the other, while operating every instant on soul and body, are apt to hide themselves from the view."* These "innate perceptions," or *intuitions*, he regards as the result of "the capacity which the mind has of perceiving objects and truths at once without a process."† And he proceeds to set down the legitimate sphere of action for induction, when brought to bear upon them. "They (immediate perceptions) discover themselves only by their effects, and their law can be detected only by a careful observation of its actings." And again, "By introspection we may look on them in operation; by abstraction or analysis we may separate the essential peculiarity from the rough concrete presentations; and by generalization, rise to the law which they follow."‡ The same train of thought is continued in two other passages, which so completely exhibit the author's view of the whole question under treatment that the reader will readily welcome their insertion *in extenso*.

But let me not be misunderstood. The method pursued, as it is not on the one hand to be confounded with an ambitious transcendentalism which declines to ask help from observation, so it is as little, on the other hand, to be identified with a miserable empiricism. I do not expect to discover what are the native principles of the mind by *à priori* speculation, but neither do I profess by observation to lay or construct a foundation on which to rear fundamental truth. I am not, therefore, to be lightly charged with a contradiction, as if I resorted to experience for a basis or ground of principles

* Page 2.

† Preface to Second Edition.

‡ Page 3.

which I represent as original and independent. I employ induction simply as a *mean* or *method* of finding laws which are prior to induction, otherwise induction could not find them. Experience is not supposed by me to furnish the ground of necessary truth ; all that it can do is to supply the facts which enable us to discover the truth, and that the truth is necessary. I allude to this objection, not with the view of formally meeting it here, but in order to show that it has not been overlooked, and then adjourn the discussion of it to its appropriate place. It will come out in the course of our survey, that while there are regulative principles in the mind, operating altogether independently of any reflex notice we may take of them, and not depending for their authority on our induction of them, it is at the same time true that they can become known to us as general principles only by inward observation, and can be legitimately employed in philosophic speculation only on the condition of being rigidly inducted. By observation we may rise to the discovery of mental principles, which do not in themselves depend on observation, but which have a place in our constitution anterior to our observation of them, and are there, as observation discovers, native, necessary, and universal.

Again :—

The native principles in the soul are analogous to the physical laws operating in external nature. Both one and other act at all times, on the necessary conditions being supplied. Like the physiological processes of respiration and the circulation of the blood, the intuitions do not depend for their operation on any voluntary determination of the human mind, and they act whether we observe them or no ; indeed they often act best when we are taking no notice of them. We cannot command their exercise on the one hand, nor prohibit it on the other. A greater or less number of them are working in the soul at every working moment of our existence. It is always to be remembered, indeed, that they are mental and not material laws ; but making allowance for this, they may be regarded as operating very much like the great physiological laws of chemical affinity, or of nervous irritability, or of the reflex nervous system. As they act in an analogous manner, so they may be discovered in much the same way as the laws of the material universe, that is, by the method of induction.*

Now in treating of Dr. M'Cosh and his labours in behalf of the science of metaphysics, it is not the purport of this paper to set forth the complete plan of the method of induction as applied by him to the discovery of genuine intuitions, and of the place in philosophy properly occupied by these intuitions so obtained. For this, recourse must be had to the work itself under notice. And thus much with respect to it may be unreservedly stated, that though there are many incidental questions—*e. g.*, Space and Time—upon which the author seems to hold very dubious opinions, yet the reader will scarcely fail

* Pp. 33 and 34.

to gather much useful philosophic information from almost every chapter. For there is hardly one in which new light is not thrown upon some old problem, by virtue of that *insight*—to use a Germanism—which the author's partial acceptance of the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic ontological school has imparted to him.

The task assumed by the present writer is rather that of pointing out the precise point at which Dr. M'Cosh seems to desert his own principles, and so to diverge from the track which, if consistently pursued, would land him amid a goodly company of Catholic friends.

He maintains, as has been seen, that there is in the mind an innate* something, of which the reflex powers take only a partial notice. He lays this down as the very basis upon which his theory rests, evidently with the purpose of bringing induction to decide which of the notions ranked by philosophers as innate are genuine, and which are spurious. But he does not venture upon anything approaching to a logical proof of his position. In the beginning of Part the First† he disclaims any intention of advancing "satisfactory proof," and refers us to Part the Second, where no proof satisfactory to the mind of an opponent is to be met with. He does not, as he might have done, take the vehicle itself, so to speak, of all argumentation, the syllogism, and demonstrate from an analysis of it, that at least one necessary truth must exist in the mind for the syllogism itself to carry any cogency whatever with it; that there must be what Kant calls *Verstand*, as distinguishable from *Vernunft*, an element objective as well as subjective in the reason of man, prior to all ratiocination or reasoning. He indeed asserts and re-asserts his thesis directly and indirectly so often throughout the earlier portions of his work, and envelops it with such a vast amount of what may be called "secondary" evidence in its favour, that the intelligent reader finds it hard to withhold his assent to a truth, a denial of which, the author shows, must lead to downright sensationalism, and of course through sensationalism to nihilism. But he does not grapple with his subject at the outset with that nerve and irresistible power which it not only requires but will readily bear. In philosophy, as in geometry, we should prove as much as we can, and only fall back upon first principles when no farther analysis is either possible or necessary. It is the partial

* The author's difficulties about the word "innate" would be obviated by changing it into "connate," which is perhaps better on many accounts than "native." See p. 20.

† Chapter II.

absence of this thorough-going application of the most important rules of true scientific research, that gives to Dr. M'Cosh's work the tone rather of a book upon philosophy for general readers than a scientific endeavour to uphold her claim to the dignity of being what she is called—the science of sciences.

The one great defect in Dr. M'Cosh is his apparent carelessness with respect to the syllogism or—to put it more broadly—syllogistic reasoning. His notion throughout seems to be that it is but at best upon a level with induction. Look at his whole theory of generalization, which, as every tyro in logic knows, is an important element in the structure, not to say the foundation itself, of the syllogism. In his Critical Review of Sir William Hamilton, he says, "He does not properly appreciate the circumstance that intuitive convictions all look to singulars, and that there is need of induction to reach the general truth. He supposes that the general truth is revealed at once to consciousness."* But is not Sir William Hamilton right and Dr. M'Cosh wrong in this matter? For surely intuitive convictions, or intuitions, do look to universals, or otherwise universals could never come under the cognisance of the human intellect. Abstraction is but a *taking something away from* what has been first presented, and must therefore yield less than existed in the original concrete. Generalization is but the application or addition of a universal to a heap of singulars.† But induction is nothing more than the union of the two processes of abstraction and generalization—a syllogism which begs its major, the universal.

There is no doubt that Aristotle, who sets down very distinctly, when treating of induction, that it is but an imperfect syllogism, really taught the same error which lies at the door of Dr. M'Cosh. He himself, in his Critical Review of Aristotle, quotes passages quite to this effect, and there are others much stronger than any quoted by him, as he would have found by referring to Chapter XIX. of the Second Book of the Posterior Analytics. Speaking of Plato he says, "He did not observe that the mind begins with the knowledge of particular objects, and must thence rise by induction to generals. He thus laid himself open to the assaults, always acute, often just, at times captious, of Aristotle, who saw that the general existed in the individuals, and that it was from the singulars that man rose to the universals."‡ If it be extreme hardihood, then, to condemn Aristotle, it is consoling

* Page 96.

† See Lectures on Metaphysics, by Sir William Hamilton, i. pp. 67, 101, *et seq.*

‡ Page 83.

to find oneself erring in defence of a name as great as the one condemned. And if it be said that there is an absence of scientific precision about Plato most apt to mislead and confuse the reader, it is quite competent for a Platonist to stand his ground against opposition to his master's tenets, despite the scientific form and precise, unmistakeable language in which that opposition may happen to present itself. It is quite enough for him to prefer Plato unscientifically right to Aristotle scientifically wrong.

Dr. M'Cosh's phrase, "who saw that the *general existed in the individuals*," taken by itself, and out of the context by which, of course, it must be judged, does not read very unorthodox. It might be understood to mean the very doctrine which is here advanced—that the universals always exist, and are always presented to the mind *with* the singulars, and that all that the mind has to do to know them thoroughly, reflexly, is to separate the singular from the universal, and so make it a distinct object of the mental vision. Such, however, is manifestly not Dr. M'Cosh's meaning, and hence his recourse to that *generalization*, the true nature and office of which he cannot thoroughly understand, or he would never have forced upon it a task quite beyond its powers, and at the same time positively unnecessary. And yet his recognition of the important difference between the two orders of thought, the intuitive and the reflective, a difference never dreamed of by Aristotle, should have kept him clear of the difficulties which beset the great Stagirite. He asserts it and ably defends it in the earlier portions of his volume, but seems to lose sight of it the very moment he most needs it, and, like Hannibal at Cannae, he turns away from the fruits of his own victory, and so makes utterly barren his earlier efforts. Let the reader examine for instance the Critical Review of Aristotle. "He has not drawn," he says, "the distinction between first principles as forms in the mind, and as individual convictions, and as laws got by induction; nor has he seen how the self-evidence and necessity, being in the singulars, goes up into the universals when (but only when) the induction is properly formed."* Yet what more clear, and at the same time more undeniable, than that the universal is intued *together with* the singular; that observation evolves, that is, makes reflex or conscious to us, the intuition of the singular; and that the collecting and grouping of singulars makes reflex or conscious to us the universals already intued with the singulars?

* Page 85.

The author seems to have been led into several of these mistakes by pushing too far his similitude between physics and metaphysics. After a lucid account* of the inductive process of reasoning in its application to physics, he says, "It is much the same way, *mutatis mutandis*, that we discover the laws of our original and native convictions." And by the context it is clear that with him "discovery" signifies the full process of a logical evolution, logical at least in so far as any kind of induction can be. Now if instead of "discover" he had substituted "arrive at a *reflex* knowledge of," there would not be another word to be said upon the matter. But as the passage stands, and as it stands it doubtless speaks the mind of the writer, the parallel cannot be accepted. In physics all our inductive superstructure is based upon some assumed general truth. If, for example, I induce the law of gravitation from the fact of every individual object being possessed of that downward tendency which is called "weight," I in reality *assume* that the particular cases which have come under my individual notice are a fair specimen of the whole class; in other words, I *assume* the very conclusion I am in quest of. And the exact point in my argument at which I make this assumption is where I smuggle into the syllogism its major premiss, which contains the precise general truth I am supposed to know nothing about until I find it in the conclusion. Once again, then, by induction we simply assume our conclusion, if such a misnomer may be let pass, and then make what amends we can for all flaws in the process, by verifying it by means of reference to special selected instances. The process of induction begins and ends and has its whole substance here. This account of it completely exhausts the subject. It is at least but an "*ex uno disco omnes*" affair, and that no one takes to be a very logical kind of formula, though its utility, when applied to many practical cases, like the utility of induction, cannot be called in question.

In metaphysics, on the other hand, our business is to get scientifically at the general truth which in physics is, as has been seen, assumed. And the processes in the two cases are widely different, in fact diametrically opposed one to the other. In physics we synthesise, in metaphysics we analyse. All we have to start with in metaphysics is our stock of primitive intuitions. We may in our reflex knowledge or developed science get less than we set out with, but by no process in the world can we possibly get more. In this life, indeed, our reflex knowledge is never on a par with our intuitive knowledge; in the next they will be in some manner merged one with

* Page 34.

the other, or rather the reflex powers will be so far increased as to make our reflexions not only the true but adequate representatives of those truths which the intuitive powers of the soul present or intue. But not in the next life any more than in this can our cognitions run beyond our intuitions. Given then our intuitions, we can analyse them, that is, we can separate the particular from the general, and proceed to make scientific use of the general so obtained. Of generals thus brought into reflex cognisance, no words can more adequately or more beautifully express the nature and philosophic value, than those of Dr. M'Cosh. "They are entitled," he says, "to be regarded as in an especial sense philosophic principles, being the ground to which we come when we follow any system of truth sufficiently far down, and competent to act as a basis on which to erect a superstructure of science. They are truths of our original constitution, having the sanction of Him who hath given us our constitution, and graven them there with His own finger."*

But the analytical process referred to fails in the mind of the author, "as the razor when applied to the rock," when brought to bear upon "the intuitive principles of the mind," which are nevertheless acknowledged to be "the simple powers to which we owe all our original conceptions."† In other words he denies that in intuition aught else but singulars is perceived or intued. And yet were he better acquainted with continental philosophy, he might have agreed with a large and increasing body of metaphysicians who hold that every intuition is of the singular in conjunction with the universal, and who adduce very cogent arguments—*à priori* as well as *à posteriori*—in proof of their tenets. For all that these writers ask is: how are the generals come by? By no logical process in the world can a conclusion be evolved of dimensions greater than the major premiss; and hence, if not given, how, it must again be asked, are the generals obtained; how do they become part and parcel of the stock of ideas in these our thinking minds?

The author, in his critical review of the opinions of his predecessors, finds great fault with Leibnitz. His comments upon that philosopher seem to the writer of this paper to afford ample illustration and proof of the inaccuracy, mistiness, and unequality, which his one great fundamental error naturally and even necessarily induces. "He (Leibnitz) separates necessary truth from things, and, making them altogether mental, he led the way to that subjective tendency which was carried so far by

* Page 36.

† Page 94.

Kant."* Now, letting alone the question as to what Leibnitz did or did not really teach, it must be admitted on all hands that "things" do bear about them to the eye of a metaphysical observer very striking traces of the Infinite hand which has formed and fashioned them. "Things," indeed, cannot present themselves to the mind without a presence immeasurably greater than their own, and a host of attendant truths which carry on their very front unmistakeable evidences of truth—truth anterior even to the "things" which are, as it were, their introducers or precursors. Doubtless, these eternal and necessary truths could not exist, and hence could never have become known to intelligences like ours, without some such aid as that afforded by "things," inasmuch as they are simply the expression of a special relation between the Infinite and the finite, and hence need "things" as creation needs creatures. And they are called eternal and necessary, not because their existence is eternal and necessary, but because the truth they convey is so. That the whole is greater than a part is an eternal and necessary truth, *i.e.*, it is a manifestation to us of the eternal and necessary truth of God in a special form, which special form needs finite things for the field of its display; even, again, as the idea of creation needs creatures as well as a Creator. Hence, looked at in one way, it is necessary; in another, contingent. Now it is this eternal and necessary element which makes the chaos between general truth and "things," and which the metaphysician must recognize or go fearfully astray. So that if Dr. McCosh's general truths are, as they would seem to be, like his other generals, mere forms of reflex thought, or spider-like evolutions from the finite and contingent, he has good reason, indeed, to dread their separation from "things," since "things" impart to them the only existence they are possessed of. But in his avoidance of the Scylla of Kant and the Transcendentalists, he here becomes engulfed in the Charybdis of Locke, Condillac, and those other Sensationalists, against whom he himself warns us in his preface. And all this arises from his failing to perceive that eternal and necessary truths have an objectivity of their own apart from the mind in which they are received or dwell.

Whether Leibnitz did or did not assert with sufficient clearness or force the objective existence of things, is not to the purport of the present inquiry; but the objectivity of things may certainly be upheld by the most zealous of those who recognize the chasm between these and general truths. And

if Leibnitz errs on the side of "extravagance" in his appreciation of necessary truths, his critic errs at the very least as much in the opposite direction.

Again: "He does not distinguish between the necessary principle as a disposition unconsciously in the mind, and a general maxim discovered by a process." Now Leibnitz certainly seems not to have grasped the idea of the important distinction between the intuitive and the reflective orders of thought. He is not the only philosopher who has spent almost a life in encountering the difficulties which the want of this knowledge must infallibly create. Balmes was singularly like Leibnitz in this life-long predicament. And, indeed, almost all modern writers—the great Gerdil himself included—who have arrived at the knowledge of this distinction, fail to work it up with their philosophy, to make it, as it should be, the leaven of their metaphysical system. Dr. M'Cosh is, unfortunately, no exception to this rule. He does not accept the common doctrine expressed by a writer upon Certainty, in the pages of the *Edinburgh Review*:—"We know, and we know that we know, and these propositions, though logically distinct, are really identical."* He is aware, as is every educated Englishman, that this is in ordinary language correct; but he submits that under everyday language there lies oftentimes concealed a host of fallacies, especially when ordinary expressions are subjected to the test of a scientific precision which they were never intended to be exposed to. Hence, with him, and in the language of his philosophy, "know" is a word of dubious meaning. It may bear reference to that hidden knowledge buried in the depths of the soul's centre, to that knowledge, say of God, which every soul possesses by virtue of its very existence;† or it may, and ordinarily does, refer to that knowledge by which a man is certain that two and two make four, and that he saw at a given period that which he took to be an eclipse of the sun. And this knowledge, because he not only has it, but knows that he has it, is termed reflex. In the former signification we know many truths of which only in process of time do we come to take reflex cognisance; and these are the "intuitions of the mind working in every man's bosom," of which Dr. M'Cosh speaks.‡

Now this is but accepting as a real distinction that which the schoolmen made but a nominal use of, and giving to "cogitatio directa," as opposed to "cogitatio reflexiva," a deeper and

* October, 1830.

† *Erat ille lux quæ illuminat omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum.*

‡ Page 19.

more philosophical signification than "first glance." Upon this doctrine, or something so near the truth as to be very similar, was based Plato's Theory of Reminiscence; and S. Austin, who owed much more to the study of Plato than of Aristotle, expressly states in the *De Immortalitate Animæ*:—"Potest igitur esse in animo, quod esse in se animus ipse non sentiat." In his Confessions, too, there are numerous passages to the same effect.*

But, strange to say, with this distinction clearly in his mind, Dr. M'Cosh fails to perceive that the only distinction between what he in one sentence calls "the necessary principle," and in the next, "individual necessary truths" and "general maxims" is subjective—that his "general maxims" arrived at by "a process," are simply the "necessary truths" formerly latent in the mind and after the process brought to light—in other words, from intuitive knowledge brought by means of the process into reflex knowledge. Is his error less than Leibnitz's here also? Leibnitz did not recognize any distinction at all between two things which only *quoad nos* are distinct. Dr. M'Cosh recognizes the distinction, but makes it one pertaining to the things themselves—objective.

The third remark upon Leibnitz is but consequent upon the second, and open to the self-same animadversions. "He does not," he says, "see that the general maxim is reached by generalizing the individual necessary truths."† This is manifestly but a reassertion of the old inductive process which, as applied by Dr. M'Cosh to metaphysics, lies open to such serious objection. And yet the value of Induction in its own legitimate sphere cannot be over-rated. Its sphere of action—its scope—lies altogether in the reflective order, and its power is great in giving a reflex or distinct knowledge even of necessary truths. It is only amenable to criticism when it goes beyond the limit which by all rules of sound logic it should not pass. Dr. M'Cosh is one of the few authors, if not the first, who has recognized the value of Induction in the study of the various phenomena in connection with the mind of man—in Mental Philosophy. Herein lies his merit, and all honour be to him for this grand move in the right direction. He has but to recognize the inability of Induction to give more than has in some form or other been originally presented, to

* See Books X. (16 and 19), XI. (5, 6, 8), XX., XXI., and the latter portion of XXV.; also, the Soliloquies, II. (19). The reader cannot do better than study well the justly celebrated 4th chapter of Book XI, "*Ecce sunt cælum,*" &c.

† "Intuitions of the Mind," p. 91.

fall back upon the intuitive order of thought for innate or con-nate truths, and to allow Intuition in his scheme of philosophy to hold its own. So modified, his work would form an un-exceptionable adjunct to the text-books of our schools, though it would by no means supply their place.

And there is one feature of his volume in particular, upon which the author may well be congratulated. That is, its style. Since the days of Plato, perhaps, a more "read-able" book upon so abstruse a subject as Philosophy Proper, or Metaphysics, has not issued from the pen of man. Throughout, the language flows on so smoothly that the reader finds himself mastering page after page without any consciousness of fatigue or *ennui*, and yet its dignity never fails of being truly philosophic. The calmness and considerateness of the author in his review of the opinions of others, or in his replies to attacks upon his own theories, never for a moment desert him, or degenerate into the contemptuous and patronizing. As a writer on metaphysics, he is a model in point of lucidity of treatment and chaste beauty of expression. And the call for a new edition of his work within two years of its publication has shown that these qualities have met with that appreciation on the part of the literary public which they justly deserve, and seldom fail to obtain.

But it is time now to turn our attention to the second work, Dr. M'Cosh's "Defence of Fundamental Truth against Mr. J. S. Mill." In a former paper an attempt was made to show that the philosophical system of Sir William Hamilton amounted to nothing less than a philosophical denial of divine faith, and went far towards that complete overthrow of all human knowledge, which Mr. John Stuart Mill has, on the assumption of his own and Sir William's principles being sound, effected.

Attention was directed to the fact that with these great philosophers of the present day, one of them has merely need to come after another to see the defects of every system but his own; and hence the phenomenon of Mr. Mill being taken as severely to task by the Rev. John Grote, as Sir William Hamilton was by Mr. Mill, and that upon the very fundamental doctrine which each professed to hold in its purity. And it was hinted that, in addition to these contradictions of each other, numberless instances were to be met with in their several writings, in which they egregiously contradicted themselves. Now, in the case of Mr. Mill no writer has yet appeared who so ably takes up this mode of attack as Dr. M'Cosh, in the second work mentioned at the beginning of this paper. He does not, however, confine himself simply to the exposure of Mr. Mill's

self-contradictions. This were but a fruitless task. "I would not," he says, "think it worth while employing a mere *argumentum ad hominem*. I feel no pleasure in pointing out real or seeming incongruities in the metaphysical system of an eminent thinker . . . I employ these admissions (extracted from Mr. Mill's writings) because they contain important truth, not always in the best form, but capable of being fully vindicated."* So he points out *in limine* the main defect in his system, and shows, as he proceeds with his examination, that this primary and fundamental error is the baneful cause ever influencing the author to philosophical ruin, ever entangling him in meshes which have by the rudest efforts to be cut and thrust asunder.

Mr. Mill's main elements are sensation and associations of sensations. He, in fact, defines mind as a series of sensations. And yet by a process which Dr. M'Cosh very aptly likens to that of the alchemists of old, he out of sensations gets ideas of necessity, universality, and the like. "We see sensations go in, and a lofty idea coming out, solely by the idea being surreptitiously introduced, without any person being expected to notice it."† This, of course, comes from his giving to sensations and their associations a power greater than belongs to them. Not, however, that he does this as directly as is here set down. No man usually commits himself to so open and plain a contradiction. But he smuggles in "experience," which looked at in one way no doubt means the result of sensations, but regarded in its widest signification, and as Mr. Mill uses it *after* he has wrapped up his sensations and their associations in it, includes very much more, *e.g.*, the very ideas which Mr. Mill subsequently extracts from it. Experience is with him the juggler's magic bag, into which pocket-handkerchiefs are thrown, and living birds and rabbits come out. The parallel between him and his critic is indeed most complete in this respect. For he takes precisely the same unwarrantable liberties with experience, which Dr. M'Cosh does with induction. And as Dr. M'Cosh had, as has been shown above, to assume the very general truths his inductive process was in quest of, so do we find Mr. Mill "ever and anon calling in other principles, some of them openly and avowedly, and others unconsciously and positively."‡ And this insomuch so that, "I am not sure that any judicious defender of fundamental truth would demand or postulate a greater number of first principles than those allowed by

* Examination, &c., p. 67.

† *Ibid.*, p. 46.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

the most influential opponent of necessary truth in our day."*

In order to expose more completely, and to combat more effectively, this pernicious tendency towards the sheerest sensationalism on the part of Mr. Mill, Dr. M'Cosh proceeds to set down what sensation is, and what it is not. And in the latter portion of his task he leaves nothing to desiderate. Where, however, he aims at giving a due explanation of the fact of sensation, he is hardly so successful. "Sensation is," he says, "an attribute of an object."† Does this mean that it is an attribute of the feeling subject or of the object felt? One would naturally suppose of the latter. But no; a page or two farther on he tells us, "Sensation is an affection, that is, an attribute of the conscious mind."‡ He, however, approaches the true statement by degrees. "I maintain," he says, a little further on, "that we are conscious, not of a mere impression, but of a thing impressed, not of sensation apart, but of self as sentient."§ And though this assertion puts forward the psychological view of the matter rather than the ontological—that is to say, states rather what we are conscious of than what actually is—still, as the two ought always to be in accordance, and in this case are so, objection can only be taken to the form in which the assertion of what sensation is, is made. It would have been more correct, and certainly more clear, to have stated that Sensation is an attribute neither of subject nor of object, any more than the act of walking is an attribute of the feet which walk, or of the ground upon which they tread. Sensation is a fact, and it is made up of two factors, the subject feeling, and the object felt; just in the same way that sight is a fact made up of the eye seeing and the thing seen. As, however, Mr. Mill's main defect lies in his attributing to sensation powers which do not properly belong to it, Dr. M'Cosh's lack of precision in giving a definite idea of what sensation is, affects his argument less than a failure in specifying what sensation is not, would have done. This he has accomplished in the most stringent manner; for he sees clearly that it is "by insisting on such points as these, we lay an effectual arrest on those rash speculations of our day which derive man's loftiest ideas from so low and subordinate an agent as sensation."||

In the matter of Memory, Mr. Mill, as might be expected, pursues the same faulty course with respect to associations of

* Examination, &c., p. 68.

† *Ibid.*, p. 72.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

† *Ibid.*, p. 71.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

sensations, which he holds to so pertinaciously so far as ideas and sensations are concerned. In other words, he, as Dr. M'Cosh most convincingly demonstrates,* ascribes to association the powers and the functions of judgment. Sensations gave him his intuitions; naturally enough, it is to associations of sensations that he looks for his judgments. It is, however, of more importance to a due appreciation of our author's singular ability in dealing with the great modern opponent of fundamental truth, that the reader's attention should be directed to the chapters upon the Relativity of Knowledge, and upon Self-evidence and Necessity being the Tests of Intuition.

The doctrine of the relativity of knowledge was treated of at considerable length in the former paper above alluded to. Dr. M'Cosh's thorough agreement upon this important point with the present writer may be best gathered by a few short but very forcible extracts:—

The doctrine I am expounding in this volume (he says) makes the relations to be in the things, and not the creation of the mind as it compares them. The opposite doctrine † reverses the order of the mind's procedure, and logically followed out, unsettles the foundation of knowledge. It makes us discover relations between things in themselves unknown, and it leaves us standing on a bridge of which we do not know that it has a support at either end. If we know a thing only in relation to another thing, and this only in relation to some other thing; as we thus ever chase the thing without catching it, we are made to feel as if we had only a series of strings put into our hands, at which we have to pull for ever without their bringing anything but other strings.‡

Again:—

Mr. Bain goes down to a still lower level, when he tells us, in a passage already quoted, that cognisance of difference and cognisance of agreement exhaust the essence of knowledge; that all we can know of a thing is its agreement with certain things, and its differences from other things, which other things, of course, can be known only as they agree with, or differ from, yet other things. Knowledge can have no resting-place when driven from one thing to another in this shuttlecock process. It falls through, by being placed between such instabilities. The way to meet all this, and put knowledge on its proper basis, is by showing that we are able to discover not only resemblances and differences, but various other important relations, which enable us to combine every one thing known with others as also known in a compact structure, in which every one part binds all the others, and helps to secure the whole.§

* Examination, &c., pp. 182, 203.

† "A thing is only seen to be what it is by contrast with what it is not."—*Mill's Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy*, p. 6.

‡ "Examination of Mill's Philosophy," p. 226.

§ *Ibid.*, pp. 227-8.

Lastly :—

I confess I can see no propriety in applying to such a theory* a phrase which had been appropriated by Sir William Hamilton, or by some of us who had criticised him, to a different doctrine. I do not see that it has any right to claim the title of "knowledge," or that it can get "relations," when it has no things to bring into relation. The theory is simply that we know sensations, and possibilities of sensations, while we cannot be said to know what sensations are. But I have no interest in giving the phrase any one special application rather than another. I believe it to be vague and ambiguous—in fact, not used by any two philosophers, I rather think by no one philosopher, at different places, in one and the same sense; and I think it should be altogether banished from speculation."†

In opposition to the doctrines here so admirably characterized and so searchingly sifted, the author proceeds to state his own theory as to human knowledge. And the only thing to be complained of in his mode of doing so, is the use he makes of the word "intuition." In many passages of his "*Intuitions of the Mind*" he limited the use of the word to express those underlying truths which are innate, or rather connate, in the soul of every man. He used it precisely in the sense which most members of the ontological school attach to it, and made it have reference to that order of thought which is distinguished completely from the reflective. In this signification an intuition of a truth which was known reflexly—that is, known and known to be known—is simply a misappropriation of terms almost amounting to a contradiction. Hence, to apply it to those truths which constitute the ordinary stock of human knowledge, and as such are referred to when there is question either of the origin, development, extent, or nature of human knowledge, is exceedingly apt to engender misapprehension and confusion. "Perception" would have been a far less objectionable term, though there are doubtless grounds for objection even to it. They are fewer, perhaps, against it than against any other in our language. But if "intuition" must be used, it should certainly be introduced with a prefatory

* "Our knowledge of objects, and even our fancies about objects, consist of nothing but the sensations they excite, or which we imagine them exciting in ourselves." "This knowledge is nearly phenomenal." "The object is known to us only in one special relation, namely, as that which produces, or is capable of producing, certain impressions on our senses; and all that we really know is these impressions." "This is the doctrine of the relativity of knowledge to the knowing mind, in the simplest, purest, and, as I think, the most proper acceptation of the words."—*Mill's Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy*, pp. 7, 14, as quoted by Dr. McCosh.

† Pp. 228-9.

explanation. Dr. M'Cosh evidently means by the term any truth—be it known, as the ontologists would say, either intuitively or reflexively—which presents itself to the mind with self-evidence of its truth. He in so understanding the term differs from another writer, between whom and himself there are many points of substantial agreement. Almost simultaneously with the first edition of the "Intuitions of the Mind" appeared Dr. Ward's "Nature and Grace;" and in the Philosophical Introduction to this able work the question of intuitions is discussed at considerable length. The difference between Dr. M'Cosh and Dr. Ward, however, is mainly but nominal; for Dr. Ward supplies the hybrid term "intuem," to stand for Dr. M'Cosh's "intuition," thus making verbal provision for a class of mental phenomena unrecognized by Dr. M'Cosh—*false intuitions*.* In addition to this he does not classify mere judgments of consciousness under the head either of intuitions or intuem. They agree in their chief test of genuine intuitions. Dr. Ward says: "I think it very important that we should be trained to contemplate, as a class, *all* those judgments, which, without being mere judgments of consciousness, carry with them *their own evidence of truth*. These judgments agree with each other in this, that a special quality of mind is called into action, to make *their truth self-evident*."† Dr. M'Cosh says: "The primary remark I hold to be self-evidence."‡ With regard also to the other tests usually adduced—necessity and universality—the difference between these two writers is less real than apparent. And both after all but amplify and more fully develop the doctrine handed down from the days of S. Thomas to the present by the traditions of our Catholic schools,§ as one extract from an ordinary text-book will suffice to show. It shall be from Liberatore's Institutiones:—

Denique quæri potest utrum certitudo ab evidentia separetur aliquando, seu utrum aliquid possit nobis certum haberi, quin tamen idem sit evidens. Qua in re distinctione est opus. Nam aut sermo est de objectis, quæ humanum captum non excedunt, et quibus vi naturalis luminis assensum præstamus, et quoad hæc fieri nequit ut evidentia a certitudine sejungatur. Nulla enim est causa cur objectum ejusmodi, si proponatur, evidenter apparere non

* "Examination of Mill's Philosophy," p. 243.

† "Nature and Grace," p. 41. (The last two phrases have been italicised by the present writer.)

‡ "Examination of Mill's Philosophy," p. 246.

§ Dr. M'Cosh seems singularly oblivious as to the labours of the schoolmen. In the Critical Review of his Intuitions of the Mind he takes a huge stride from the Epicureans to the English Divines of the 17th century.

debeat, cum et in se evidentiam habeat, et mentis nostræ viribus sit consentaneum et menti nonnisi per aliquam evidentiam applicetur.*

One must nevertheless confess with Dr. Ward, that sufficient attention has not been paid by philosophers to this all-important topic of the tests of intuition, and that there are grounds for his assertion that, "until the question of intuitions has been systematically and fully considered, I must think it truer to affirm that most copious and valuable *materials* for metaphysical science have been brought together, than to affirm that that science itself has been definitely called into existence." † That Dr. M'Cosh has, in his "Intuitions of the Mind," made an able attempt to put the whole question of intuitions upon a more satisfactory footing has been already observed, and that he has in so doing added much to the mass of "most copious and valuable *materials* for metaphysical science," has been unreservedly acknowledged; but he has by no means succeeded in calling the science itself, again to use Dr. Ward's phrase, into definite existence. Before this can be done, a sharp distinction must be drawn and kept between those acts and processes of the mind of which we are conscious and those, the existence of which by *à priori* or by *à posteriori* arguments we can demonstrate, but of which we are unconscious. And if these latter are to be termed, as Dr. M'Cosh does actually term them, "intuitions," ‡ then to those primary principles of the mind of which we are conscious, and which Dr. M'Cosh, together with Dr. Ward, also styles "intuitions," § some other appellation must be given. "Perceptions," "cognitions," or by any other name let them be called, but let "intuitions" be reserved for those unconscious presentations—as opposed to *re-presentations*—of the mind which exist in every soul by virtue of that "light which enlighteneth every man." Next, a distinction equally well defined must be made between those truths of which we are conscious—reflex as opposed to intuitive truths—and others which are the result of ratiocination or of authority. And here is the wide field in which there is great need of metaphysical work; here precisely it is that the writings of both Dr. M'Cosh and Dr. Ward will prove of extreme utility to the metaphysical workman. Were this huge labour satisfactorily accomplished, much would doubtless remain still to be done; but the grand difficulty would have been got over, and the course would be invitingly clear

* Page 60. † "Nature and Grace," p. 38.

‡ "Intuitions of the Mind," p. 4.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 411; "Nature and Grace," pp. 5, &c.

for the prosecution of further and more telling, though less important because less fundamental, efforts.

From this brief sketch of Dr. M'Cosh's labours in the field of philosophy, and of the especial ability he has shown in his earnest defence of fundamental truth, it is easy to come to a decision as to which of the two writers, our author or Mr. John Stuart Mill, should enlist the sympathies of the Catholic metaphysician. But Dr. M'Cosh has not only the advantage of being on the right side; he, as has been already mentioned, adds to this the next best advantage—the good sense and the power to advance his views and defend them, in a suitable manner. He is in nowise inferior to his brilliant, but at times—philosophically speaking—flippant, adversary in keenness of satire or in sharpness of repartee; but he seldom has recourse to anything beyond a searching and discriminating analysis of his opponent's arguments, and a calm but unmistakeably lucid exposition of his own, accompanied very frequently by peculiarly apt and striking illustrations. It is almost beyond the province of the present paper to make any direct reference to religion, but it is hard to conclude without noticing the great contrast between the two writers whenever the course of their arguments at all leads them to touch upon it. Suffice it to say that, whereas Mr. Mill does not affect to conceal his unbelief, Dr. M'Cosh takes every opportunity of showing, not only for the fundamental truths of the human intellect, but especially for the supernatural manifestations of the divine will, that reverence which manifestly fills his soul.

R. E. G.

ART. IX.—THE STATE OF AFFAIRS.

*Report of the Meeting of the Confraternity of St. Peter in St. James's Hall,
December 6th, 1866.*

THE year 1866 will long be memorable in the annals of mankind for the events which it witnessed; and it may, perhaps, be still more memorable, for those of which it was the precursor and the mould. It has to record the most decisive battle fought on the Continent of Europe since the battle of Waterloo; but, unlike Waterloo, the battle of Sadowa has not brought a universal peace to the world, but has been the signal for armaments on the part of every nation in Europe, the most exhaustive to the population, the most expensive to the resources, the most destructive in equipment that ever existed, or that can at present by any possibility be conceived. Europe is fast becoming one vast stratocracy. Moreover, alongside of this tremendous organization of physical force has been developed in the course of the year that is gone, a fact in the moral order of a still more awful significance. It is now recognized throughout Europe openly and without shame or any apparent disposition to shrink from the consequences, that the old public law of Christendom has come to an end, and no longer binds kings, statesmen, or public opinion; and especially that what few fragments of the great Treaties of Vienna remain unviolated, must now cease to have any further effect. While the bonds of the old family of states are thus rent asunder, and the modern doctrine of non-intervention tends to segregate nation from nation, and the "balance of power" in Europe has utterly ceased to exist, a wondering world sees the portentous league of Russian despotism and American democracy solemnly inaugurated, and hears that the Eastern Question, closed it had been hoped for half a century at least, by the costly and bloody sacrifices of the Crimean War, is again yawning — reopened this time not by the ambitious diplomacy of Russia, but by the restless spirit of the Revolution, and by the direct agency of the two new revolutionary kingdoms, Greece and Italy. Among the minor incidents of this wonderful year, it may be hereafter written that it was that one in which the English people for the first time realized the fact, in a moment when their wide empire enjoyed profound peace, that the immense prosperity upon which it rested

was capable of sudden and disastrous collapse; that their commercial credit, as tested by the price of money, might fall even below that of the Spaniard or the Greek; and that the two great factors of their industry, coal and iron, were gradually slipping from their grasp. The historian of the French Empire in his turn will probably parallel the fourteenth year of the Second Empire with the eighth of the First. No Russian frost, no foundering army slain by the elements, no gathering coalition of sovereigns and nations menace the throne of Napoleon III. with the same fate which befell that of Napoleon I. in 1812. But the year 1866 will always be written as the year in which fortune first began to fail the nephew as it failed the uncle of old; the year in which he ceased to occupy the foremost place among the sovereigns and statesmen of Europe; the year in which men first began to discuss the event of his death as an ordinary topic which might after all happen without the accompaniment of a deluge; the year in which his most original enterprise, the Mexican empire, came to a collapse full of strange, tragical, and scandalous elements, and vanished into the air while the French flag was pelted into the Atlantic by ragged bands of meztizoes of the Latin race, reluctant to be regenerated by the immortal principles of 1789; it will be very well remembered as the year in which the frontiers of France were, despite both threat and entreaty, petrified by the keener genius and sterner will of Bismarck; the year, finally, in which the Emperor abandoned that protectorate of the Papacy which the French Republic undertook before he had attained to supreme power, and under the yoke of which the Sovereign Pontiff, despoiled of his provinces, is at last left standing in a position which his enemies boast is thoroughly undermined. It seems quite a secondary event, in such a memorable year, that it was the one in which the proud boast *L'Italia farà da se* was at last magnificently fulfilled; the glorious victories of Custozza and Lissa added to those of Castelfidardo and Gaeta, and to those of Solferino and Magenta, on the national standards and annals; and the hated Austrian at last driven from the Quadrilateral and over the Alps by the unaided energies of a patriotic king and a valiant people. So is history written. Nevertheless, with the closing year there is a strange pervading sense of uncertainty and tension throughout all Europe, not unlike the stifling air and the appalling stillness which precede a tropic storm. Those who have prepared or permitted it would now conjure away if they could, would obviate or palliate by any possible process the impending collision between the Papacy and the Revolution; but he whom God has commissioned to meet and to master it,

by his martyrdom even, if that be necessary, has described in words that will never perish, the character of the contest that is coming—words addressed by the Sovereign Pontiff to the French general and garrison on the eve of their departure from Rome:—

On the eve of your departure I present you, O my sons, my greetings. Your flag, which left France eighteen years ago with the mission of defending the Holy See, was accompanied by the good wishes and desires of all the Powers and of all Catholic countries. To-day it returns to France. I wish that it may be received with the same acclamations, but I greatly doubt it.

They write to me that Catholic hearts are alarmed by the thought of the difficult situation in which the Head of the Church and of Religion is placed. As I have already said to others of your comrades, we must not delude ourselves; the Revolution will come hither. It has said so and proclaimed it; you have heard it, understood it, seen it.

Words have been placed in the mouth of a great personage, that *Italy is made, but not yet completed*. I, in my turn, will say that, if she is not yet completely undone, if she exists as she does, it is because there is still a fragment of the earth where I am, in which justice, order, and peace reign. When that shall no more be so, I see the flag of the Revolution float over the Capitol, but I see also that the Tarpeian Rock is not far off.

Five or six years ago I conversed with a representative of France. He asked me before leaving Rome what he should tell the Emperor. I answered, Tell him that St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, when he saw the city besieged by an army of barbarians, and all the evils about to befall it when that army should enter, said to God, "Let me die before witnessing that ruin." Say that from me to the Emperor. The French ambassador replied, "Holy Father, be of good courage. The barbarians will not enter." He was not a prophet, but he was an honest man.

Another French representative, now in a high place, said to me, "Rome cannot be the capital of a kingdom. She has nothing to make her so, while she has everything to remain the capital of Catholicism." Those words were a very great consolation to me. But I repeat, the thing may come to pass. I am weak. I have no resource upon earth. Notwithstanding, I am tranquil, because I trust in a Power which will give me the strength of which I stand in need. That Power is God.

Go, my sons, go with my blessing and with my love. If you see the Emperor, tell him that I pray for him daily. I am told that he is suffering, and I pray that he may recover his health. I am assured that he is troubled in mind, and I pray God to restore him calm. But if I pray for him, he must do something for me, since he bears the title of "very Christian," and since France is the eldest-born daughter of the Church. It is not enough to bear titles—men must also justify them by acts, men must pray with perseverance, with humility, with confidence. By such trust in God the head of a nation that is respected by all becomes strong, and may obtain what he will.

I see that the world is not at ease. As for me, I place my trust in the

mercy of God, and I fear nothing. I give you my blessing. May it ever accompany you along the rugged path of life !*

Such, then, are the words of the Pope—words worthy of himself, of the Apostolic See, and of the occasion ; and they make manifest with absolute frankness his whole position and policy. The Vicar of Christ is at the mercy of Divine Providence. He knows not whither to turn or on whom to lean, God alone excepted ; and, notwithstanding all that has befallen and all that threatens him, he trusts in God, it seems, and fears neither man nor fiend, nor men possessed of fiends. His Holiness knows that the Revolution will reach Rome, and that he must either become its prisoner or go into exile. When that moment comes, his course is decided. Another Apostolic pilgrim will be added to the list of those Pontiffs who have been obliged to seek the peace and freedom essential for the discharge of their sacred office outside the city of the Holy See. But beforehand he takes good care to let the whole Christian world know that he attributes the chief responsibility in regard to his present position to the Emperor of the French. At such a moment, then, it may be well to review in brief detail the policy which his Imperial Majesty has pursued towards the Roman Government since his elevation to supreme power in France.

It is always well to bear in mind that the Constituent Assembly had decided on the expedition to Rome before the election of Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte to the Presidency of the Republic. Though in his election addresses, the Prince had declared strongly in favour of the maintenance of the Civil Sovereignty of the Pope, the majority of the Assembly evidently regarded his earnestness in that cause with some degree of distrust. They knew that in his youth he had fought in a rebellion against the Roman Government, and had belonged to the secret society of which the then Triumvirs had been the leaders. The army ordered to occupy Rome appeared to halt and hesitate, and the influence of the executive over its movements was apparently suspected. Five months had passed from the date of the installation of the Prince as President, when, on the 8th of May, the National Assembly felt itself called upon to pass the following resolution :—

The National Assembly requests the Government to take the necessary measures, that the expedition of Italy be no longer diverted from the end which was assigned to it.

Upon this vote the President wrote a letter to General Oudinot, ordering him to force his way into Rome ; and in

* We avail ourselves of the excellent translation of the *Tablet*.

his first message to the Assembly on the 7th of June, he explained what in his view was the object of the expedition and the policy of France at Rome. He said :—

It seemed easy to us to make the Romans comprehend that, pressed on all sides, they had no chance of safety but in us ; that if our presence had for its result the return of Pius IX., that Sovereign, faithful to himself, would restore with him reconciliation and liberty ; that, once at Rome, we should guarantee the integrity of his territory in removing all pretext for the entrance of Austria into the Romagna. We could even hope that our flag, unfolded without opposition in the centre of Italy, would spread its protecting influence over the entire Peninsula, of which none of the troubles can find us indifferent.

He continues, however, to state, that the arrival at Rome of "Garibaldi at the head of a band of refugees from all parts of Italy, and even from the rest of Europe," had forbidden the hope of a peaceable accommodation. "This unexpected collision, however," he adds, "without in any way changing the final end of our enterprise, has paralyzed our benevolent intentions, and rendered vain the efforts of our negotiations." The end of the Roman expedition, it is well to remember, was thus from the first avowed to be not merely the restoration of the Pope, but the guarantee of the integrity of his entire territory by the honour of France.

The Pope was hardly settled in the Vatican when the President, returning for a moment to the sympathies to which was already attributed the slowness of Oudinot's first movements, wrote the presumptuous letter to Colonel Edgar Ney, his officer of Ordonnance, then at Rome, which excited so strange a sensation at the time. The most salient passage of this letter was the following :—

I learn with pain that the benevolent intentions of the Holy Father, as also our own action, remain sterile in the presence of passions and of hostile influences. Some would wish to give for a base to the return of the Pope proscription and tyranny. Say on my part to General Rostolan that he must not permit that, under the shadow of the tricolour flag, any act shall be committed which may distort the character of our intervention.

I sum up as follows the re-establishment of the temporal power of the Pope : *a general Amnesty, Secularization of the Administration, the Code Napoleon, and a Liberal Government.*

These suggestions, meant to conciliate the Carbonari and to flatter the French democracy, had not even that effect. They were treated by the Pontifical Government as simply *non-avenus*. And now followed a period of two years, during which the President, beginning to see his way clearly towards the conversion of the Republic into an Empire, felt that with

the more solid interests of society, which it was absolutely necessary for him to conciliate, his most powerful means of ingratiating himself was by quietly assuming the whole credit and glory of the Roman expedition, and by continuing to maintain the attitude of armed Protector of the Papacy. The letter to Colonel Ney was allowed to fall quietly into oblivion. In the annual message to the Legislative Assembly on the 12th of November, 1850, the President's tone had undergone a complete change, and he thus speaks of the situation at Rome :—

Our arms have overthrown at Rome that turbulent demagoguery which, throughout the entire Italian peninsula, had compromised the cause of true liberty, and our brave soldiers have had the distinguished honour of restoring Pius IX. to the throne of St. Peter. The spirit of party shall never be able to obscure this memorable fact, which will be a glorious page for France. The constant end of our endeavours is to encourage the liberal and philanthropic intentions of the Holy Father. The Pontifical Government pursues the realization of the promises contained in the *motu proprio* of the month of September, 1849. Some of the organic laws have already been published, and those completing the administration and military organization of the States of the Church will not be delayed. It is not useless, perhaps, to say that our army, necessary still to the maintenance of order at Rome, adds also to our political influence.

The following year was that of the *Coup d'Etat*. Within twelve months the Empire followed, and then began a period in which the glory of the Second Empire seemed to exceed that of the first. It is told that, the day after the *Coup d'Etat*, the Prince President said to M. de Montalembert these remarkable words :—"Be assured, at all events, that there are two mistakes which I shall never make: one is a rupture with England; the other a rupture with Rome." This rule of policy governed, and was the secret of all the great successes of the Empire. In alliance with England, the Emperor achieved the triumphs of the Crimean war, at the commencement of which the Czar would not condescend to address him as an equal, and at the end of which he stood undisputed head of European sovereigns. Meantime, recognized throughout the Catholic world as piously fulfilling the duties of Eldest Son of the Church in guarding against all danger, whether from within or from without, the person and dignity of the Holy Father, his early connection with the Italian secret societies and his letter to Colonel Ney were forgotten, or only remembered, like his foolhardy expeditions to Strasbourg and Ham, as strange illustrations of the complete, the almost miraculous transformation, which time, power, responsibility, and the

sense of a certain Providential mission had made in the whole character and temper of the man. It was a period of great spiritual glory in the government of the Church. The return of Pius IX. to Rome was followed by a series of acts of such power and magnitude as is hardly to be paralleled from any period of the same duration in the history of the Church. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception was proclaimed. The hierarchies of England and Holland were called into being. The Josephian laws were swept away in Austria, and the Concordat concluded with that empire and with the kingdom of Spain. It was a period during which, in the missionary countries, new Sees were erected literally by the hundred. From all the ends of the earth there seemed to be a continual concourse to Rome; and, in all these triumphs of the Papacy, the Catholic world did not fail to be grateful and to honour him, who was regarded as the champion of the Church—whose strong arm sufficed to keep its enemies at bay, and thus enabled the Pontiff to apply all his mind, without fear of disturbance, to the duties of his august mission. It was a position which immensely increased the Emperor's power and *prestige* at home and abroad, and which doubtless brought a strength and a blessing, wise inspirations and good luck with it. It was a position which spoke for itself, and he simply allowed it to do so. It is a curious fact that in all his public discourses, messages, letters, and proclamations, from the date of the year before the *Coup d'Etat* to the year of the Italian war, there is not a single syllable of reference to the occupation of Rome by his troops. The topic disappears from his annual speech to the legislative bodies. The published letters to his ministers, in which he was then occasionally in the habit of explaining his policy, contain no reference to it. The presence of a French garrison at Rome does not seem to have been regarded by him as a matter for which he was called upon to make apology, any more than he would for the occupation of Paris or Algiers. The last time he had spoken on the subject he said it added *prestige* to the policy of France, and that *prestige* he allowed quietly to accumulate. There never was a more communicative sovereign, so far as popular expositions of policy are concerned; but on this one most momentous subject he was silent towards the French people for eight years after he had attained to supreme power. The only reference to be found to the Papacy in all that time is in his message to the Legislative Corps after the birth of the Prince Imperial, in which he speaks of the benediction of the Holy Father, sent to the infant by electricity within an hour of his birth, as an ample augury of his future destinies.

Meantime, however, the occupation of Rome was regularly brought under his notice and that of the whole world at no long intervals in a way that could not fail to attract his attention, and in the end excite his anxiety. At least once a year an Italian conspiracy was organized against his life. Sometimes it was detected in advance, and its agents and implements seized as they crossed the French frontier. Sometimes a single assassin, armed with a pistol, took all the risk in his own person. Sometimes the bullet passed within a yard of his Majesty's head. Sometimes it was discovered that a mere chance had prevented him from keeping an appointment, on the road to which all the means were prepared for his murder. His escape from the last of these attempts, that of Orsini, in which the bombshells burst under his carriage, was all but miraculous. For years the Emperor sustained these successive dangers with imperturbable courage. What his exact feeling in regard to them may have been, it is difficult to fathom. But the line of speech in which he treated them was always a high line. He said on one occasion that his mission was not yet fulfilled; and that, until it was accomplished, no assassin's hand had power to destroy him. Another occasion he improved to the purpose of a philosophic discourse on political assassinations. He said:—

These plots convey more than one useful lesson: the first is, that those parties who recur to assassination prove by these desperate means their feebleness and their impotence; the second is, that never has an assassination, when it succeeded, served the cause of those who had armed the assassins. Neither the party which struck down Cæsar, nor that which struck down Henry IV., profited by their murder. God may permit sometimes the death of the just, but He never permits the triumph of the cause of crime. And so these attempts can never trouble either my security in the present, or my faith in the future. If I live, the Empire lives with me; and if I fall, the Empire will still be strengthened even by my death, for the indignation of the people and of the army would be a new source of support to the throne of my son.

It is remarkable, again, that he is never tempted to refer to the fact that all these plots against his person were Italian plots, and not plots contrived or attempted by his own subjects. Brutus was a Roman, Ravallac was a Frenchman; but Pianori and Orsini did not pretend to have any grievance against the Emperor of the French. The one notorious cause why his life was perpetually menaced was his occupation of Rome. It is curious, too, to consider that the Emperor of Austria also occupied an extensive district of Papal territory, and exercised a much greater influence over the policy of the

Italian sovereigns than did the Emperor of the French. But the Mazzinians never made an attempt upon the life of Francis Joseph. The reason why the Emperor of the French was selected, it has always been avowed, is that they regarded him as one of their brethren who had broken his bond.

But the attempt of Orsini evidently shook the Emperor's nerve at last. Notwithstanding the philosophic tone in which he treated the cases of Brutus and Ravallac before the legislative bodies, it was remarked as a strangely significant fact that the letter which Orsini had addressed to his Majesty the day before his execution was, within the following week, officially published in the *Moniteur*. In this letter Orsini appealed to the Emperor to undertake the liberation of Italy himself, warning him that, if he did not, some avenger would be sure to spring from his bones to carry on this vendetta of assassination to the end. Italian conspiracies were becoming more and more frequent, becoming more and more exclusively Italian (for the Empire seemed to have now established itself on the loyal good-will of the French nation), and were becoming more and more exclusively composed of refugee Romans. Pianori was a Roman, Tibaldi was a Roman, Orsini was a Roman; and the avowed object of Mazzini, the real master of all these men, ever since his return to England in 1849, the object which secured him asylum, support, and funds, was his return to Rome in order to abolish the Papacy. Six months had only intervened between the attempt of Tibaldi and that of Orsini. The attempts became each time more deadly and better contrived. There seemed to be no limit upon the extent to which they were capable of being organized in England, for the most powerful and popular Minister of his age, Lord Palmerston, had just lost power for attempting to make the law in regard to such conspiracies more strict. The Foreign Conspiracy Bill had been rejected by Parliament, and one of Orsini's companions acquitted amid popular acclamation at the Old Bailey. It seems to have been at this time that, much meditating on his whole situation, the Emperor first yielded to the servile feeling of fear. Hitherto he had regarded himself as a providential person, sure of the Divine protection while he fulfilled his mission. A certain rapidity of initiative and daring energy of execution characterized all his policy; it claimed to be always heroically original, and to have in it the long forecast of a previous purpose. Men said that he was only carrying out from day to day what he had premeditated in prison, and often talked over to his intimates in exile. A great deal of his power over the mind of the French nation, and of other nations too, arose from this frequently avowed

.

faith in his mission, sometimes leading him to an audacity of expression bordering on blasphemy, as when he said, in 1856, in face of the disastrous inundations of that year, that "Rivers, like revolutions, must retire to their beds," as if he had closed or could close the era of either inundations or revolutions. A time had come, however, in which he never must venture to use such language any more. This element of extravagant faith in his vocation, gradually disappeared from his words as the sense of fear crept into his heart. Any one who carefully reads the formal documents of the Emperor Napoleon before and after the attempt of Orsini must mark this strange change in them. Before that date there is firm, fierce faith, resolute volition, prophetic confidence in their every word. The French nation may trust in him. He sees everything, he foresees everything. He answers not for the present only, for the future too. His documents since are not less able; and no statesman of this or of any other time has written so many documents of such condensed clearness, and such brilliant potency of phrase. But the latter series of documents, the documents since Orsini, have all a certain air of apology. He speaks no longer as one charged with a political inspiration and mission, but as a man who professes to understand by dint of observation the tendencies of thought of the age in which he lives, and who follows instead of leading public opinion. Formerly, when he uttered a word, that word was law for himself, for the French nation and for all mankind, so far as that word concerned them. During last year, the whole world was witness to the utter and complete contempt with which Count von Bismarck first, and since Mr. Seward, treated him in matters of state, where he had personally committed the honour of the French nation. It is impossible to imagine the Emperor Napoleon of the year 1857 submitting, after such a speech as his speech at Auxerre, and after such a letter as his letter to M. Drouyn de Lhuys, regarding the possible results of the German war, to the excruciating humiliation of having to allow such a despatch as that of the Marquis de Lavalette to be published. Nor is it possible to conceive that ten years ago he would have suffered Mr. Seward to actually order the French troops out of Mexico in the way of which the whole world has become aware within the last fortnight, and would then receive an American Ambassador with such a drivelling sentence as this:—"A loyal and sincere agreement between France and the American Union will, I doubt not, tend to the profit of industry and commerce which daily astonish the world by their prodigies, and will insure the progress of civilization. Your presence among us cannot but

contribute to this happy result by maintaining the relations to which I attach so much value." Surely no "fifth transmitter of a foolish face" ever spoke such a thoroughly foolish and undignified sentence at such a moment.

But before the time of M. von Bismarck, not to speak of Mr. Seward, the early pretensions of the Emperor to be a dispenser of destiny had been sorely humbled. In truth, from the hour that he allowed the fear of assassination to enter his heart, from that hour he ceased to have a policy of his own. He became, most reluctantly there is every reason to suppose, the slave of the revolution; and the real secret of his life from that time to this has probably been, only on a grander scale, like that of Count Fosco in Mr. Wilkie Collins's marvellous story. No deliberate attempt, which in any way endangered his person, has, indeed, been made since that of Orsini—nor was any necessary. When Lord Palmerston and Lord Clarendon visited at Compiègne a few months after the rejection of the Conspiracy Bill, they were utterly astounded to hear his Majesty declare that he intended forthwith to liberate Italy. A little later in the year, Count Cavour was invited to Plombières, the marriage of Prince Napoleon with the Princess Clotilde was arranged; and both Count Cavour and Prince Napoleon stood in such a position that they could pass the word of order to the secret societies. Long before all Europe was startled by the angry words addressed to the Austrian Ambassador on New Year's-day, 1859, every Italian revolutionist knew that their great enemy had become their great ally. No more bomb-shells were forged by sympathizing citizens of Birmingham, and the dagger of Brutus rusted in some humble attic in Leicester Square.

To escape the increasing certainty of assassination the Emperor embraced the perilous chance of war; and he fought and barely won two great battles. But then, he seemed to grow suddenly appalled before his own undertaking to free Italy from the Alps to the Adriatic, and patching up a hasty peace, rushed back to Paris. He had proved unable to redeem his promise to the Italians; but he was also unable to restrain the Italians from violating his promises to the Pope and to the Austrians. "We do not go into Italy," he had said in his proclamation to the French people, "to foment disorder or to disturb the power of the Holy Father, whom we have replaced on his throne, but to relieve it from that foreign pressure which weighs on the whole peninsula and to contribute to found order on legitimate interests satisfied." In the treaty of Villafranca, he had conditioned that the Pope should be placed in guaranteed possession of his states, and that even the

expelled dukes should be restored. But the Sardinian Government utterly refused to be bound by any engagement of the kind, and stimulated the revolutionary party with all its energy, until it had achieved the annexation of every state in Italy except the province of Venetia and the patrimony of S. Peter.

But the declarations with which the French Government commenced the war against Austria were not restricted to the memorable passage in the Emperor's speech. The most formal assurances were given by his Majesty's ministers that he entered Italy with the fixed resolve that none of its sovereigns should be dispossessed; and, above all, that the independence of the Pope and the integrity of his States were under the special protection of the military honour of France. This was a specific part of the programme of the famous pamphlet, *Napoléon III. et l'Italie*, which, it was well known, was written under the direct sanction and inspiration of his Majesty, and in considerable part by his own pen. In addressing the French clergy by circular on the eve of the war, M. Rouland, the minister of Public Worship, wrote these words:—"The Prince, who has given to religion so many evidences of deference and of attachment, who has restored the Holy Father to the Vatican, wills that the Supreme Chief of the Church be respected in all his rights of temporal Sovereign." At the same time M. Baroche, President of the Council of State, declared in the Legislative Corps:—"No doubt is even possible on this point. The Government will take all the necessary measures to ensure the safety and the independence of the Holy Father." To allay the uneasiness of the French Catholics, his Majesty's ministers and other organs constantly quoted at that time the words of his letter to the Nuncio at Paris before his election to the Presidency, in which he had said:—"The temporal sovereignty of the venerable Chief of the Church is intimately allied to the dignity of Catholicism, as well as to the liberty and independence of Italy." Deputies were rebuked who presumed to entertain a doubt, and told that the restoration of the Papacy was one of the proudest *souvenirs* of the Emperor's policy. Later M. Baroche proclaimed that "the French Government regarded the temporal power as an essential condition of the independence of the Holy See"—that "it must not be destroyed," and that "the mission of the French army at Rome was to protect at once the temporal power, the independence, and the safety of the Holy Father." Yet, when the Revolution seized upon the Legations after the departure of the Austrians, and promptly transferred them to the safe keeping of Piedmont, the Emperor made no sign.

The French army, it was declared, had occupied Rome in order to maintain in their integrity the States of the Church. But, when two provinces were appropriated by the Emperor's ally in Rome, but actual political dependent, he did not utter a word. Why? Was it because Pianori was a Romagnole? A little later the Piedmontese army entered the Marches on a pretext so audaciously false that its defence on moral grounds was never even attempted in the court of public opinion, and with every conceivable circumstance of brutal unfairness overwhelmed the Papal army. The whole world knew that a word from the French Government would have stayed Victor Emmanuel's army. But the Emperor, who, it was boasted by the Italians, had secretly directed the whole operation himself, went to Algeria on the eve of its taking place. By an ingenious accident the telegraph wire between France and Africa got broken in the very nick of time; and when he returned, the work was a syllogism in the "logic of accomplished facts." Did his Majesty, when at Chambéry he told Cialdini, *Frappez vite et frappez fort*, remember that Tibaldi was an Umbrian? Finally came the disgraceful Convention of September, the basest act of modern diplomacy, by which, without reference to the Pope, it was secretly conditioned with the Power which had already despoiled him of more than two-thirds of his territories, that the French troops would, within a given time, withdraw from Rome. Assurances were given, but they had also been given in the case of the Legations and the Marches. Engagements were stipulated, but engagements had also been made at Villafranca. Before the ink was dry on the Convention, the Piedmontese Government repudiated the construction put upon it that they were, by its provisions, forbidden from ever, under any circumstances, going to Rome. And it was only when it had been signed and sealed, and the world was discovering its true sense, that the Pope learned that the French Emperor, who had sent an army to Rome in order to maintain the integrity of the States of the Church, who had so long remained there, in order to secure the independence of the temporal power, and who was again and again pledged before Christendom to guarantee the safety of the Pontifical authority, was abandoning all in the dark, without a word of reference to the Holy Father. This was assuredly the triumph of Orsini.

It is well to recall, at the moment of the execution of this Convention, the fact that the protection which it withdraws was at various times during the last eighteen years continued, because it suited the general policy of the French Empire, contrary to the Pope's express wish. In the period of ten years, which intervened between the election of the Prince

President and the commencement of the Italian war there were several occasions when the Pope expressed his willingness and readiness to undertake the entire administration, military as well as civil, of his own States; but, on the other hand, up to the precise moment when it came to involve the imminent risk of his life, it was notorious that the Emperor regarded his occupation of Rome as a substantial guarantee for the security of the Empire, and even as a premium of insurance for his dynasty. The language which Count Cavour was allowed to use at the Conferences after the peace of 1856 was concluded does not at all affect this fact. At that very time the Pope was willing and anxious that the foreign occupation should cease. Count Cavour was allowed to make a demonstration, because Sardinia must have something to show for having entered on a war in which she had no conceivable concern; but his own correspondence shows that he had made little real way at the time with French statesmen, and still less with English. The oppressive protection of the French Emperor was, nevertheless, continued; and, so long as the French were at Rome, of course the Austrians remained in the Legations. When, however, war seemed imminent between them in 1859, the Pope formally and, so far as the French were concerned, in vain demanded that they should at once evacuate his territories. According to the *Moniteur* of the 27th of February, 1859, "His Eminence Cardinal Antonelli announced by order of his Holiness on the 22nd instant to their Excellencies the Ambassadors of France and Austria at the Court of Rome that the Holy Father, full of gratitude for the succour which their Majesties the Emperor of the French and the Emperor of Austria had given him up to that day, thought it his duty to announce to them that his Government would in future be strong enough to suffice for its own security and for the maintenance of peace in his States; and that, consequently, the Pope declared himself ready to enter into an arrangement with the two Powers for concerting the simultaneous evacuation of his territory by the French and Austrian armies with as little delay as possible." The war speedily followed; the Austrians evacuated the Legations. A revolutionary movement, strongly aided by Prince Napoleon, then commanding a division of the French army in Central Italy, deposed the Papal authorities. But the French garrison received no orders to evacuate Rome. It remained there until it saw the Legations annexed to Piedmont; until it saw the army which the Pope was organizing for his defence cut to pieces, and the remaining eastern provinces of the Papacy simply occupied by conquest also by Piedmont; finally, until it

was completely convenient to the Emperor's policy, without even consulting the Pope's wishes, that it should by arrangement with this same power, Piedmont, now called the kingdom of Italy, evacuate Rome. The French flag has remained at Rome until it has witnessed the entire ruin of the state resources of the Papacy, giving its sanction to the spoliation of its provinces, treating only with its enemies about its concerns, preventing directly and indirectly the assistance of its allies. The last reported diplomatic act of the French Government caps the climax of a series of such infamous treachery as is not to be paralleled in the annals of mankind. It has, if we are correctly informed, by its urgent and repeated remonstrances, succeeded in inducing Lord Stanley to withdraw the invitation of the late Government, tendering to his Holiness an honourable asylum at Malta in the case of his being compelled to leave Rome. If these were the acts of man to man, or simply of one civil state to another, we would know that it is only according to the course of history and the order of Providence to expect the sure, slow action of retributive justice. But history also tells us that the retributive justice of God in regard to the sovereigns and people of France, whenever they have attempted to interfere with the just authority of the Papacy, or to use it for their own purposes, has been sure, and also swift. The sovereign of France is proud to call himself the Eldest Son of the Church; and no French sovereign who has been even decently observant of the duties which attach to such a title has ever forfeited his throne thereby. But, as the Pope says, "it is not enough for men to bear titles—they must also justify them by acts." Now, it has been too much the tendency of French sovereigns and governments to take whatever credit, honour, and influence they could from the position in Christendom which such a relation with the Papacy gave them, and at the same time to take liberties with the Papacy, and to attempt to use it for their own purposes in a way upon which no other Catholic state has dared to venture. The French government, last year for example, presumed to forbid the publication of the Encyclical *Quantà curà* by the French bishops; and when it was censured for such un-Catholic conduct, it justified itself on the score that the governments of Charles X. and of Louis Philippe had forbidden the promulgation of Papal documents of a similar character in 1829 and in 1847. They were unfortunate precedents to quote, for the world is aware what became of the government of Charles X. in 1830, and of Louis Philippe in 1848. The fate of French governments seems to be to begin by relying on the Catholic and Conservative elements of society, and to end by

being fascinated and demoralized by the peculiar infidel and profligate atmosphere of Paris—so that when Paris pleases to make a revolution, the sympathies of the provinces have been long so far alienated, that a government falls without any class whatever having the will to raise a hand in its support. At the present moment, it is not altogether clear that the Emperor is popular with Paris. But it is certain that the entire French clergy, the Catholic aristocracy, manufacturing, and agricultural classes, feel a bitter disgust at the way in which the Holy Father has been used. The masses of the peasantry and labouring classes are reported to be unanimously and fiercely opposed to the new and excessively exhaustive conscription, by which it is proposed to raise France to the present level of such military powers as Prussia and Russia—for France, it must be remembered, is now in numbers, and indeed even in armament, only a second class military power. The French army itself knows that the Emperor, when it came to a question of fighting for the Rhine frontier last year, showed the white feather. It has been told in very solemn words by the Pope himself, his opinion of the Emperor's conduct in regard to the evacuation of Rome; it will soon hear from its comrades returning from Mexico the humiliation to which their retreat thence has been exposed. An atmosphere of danger, disgrace, and disaster begins to envelope the Empire; and it is most strange to observe in how short a time it has arisen. During the first half of the year 1866, the Emperor appeared to have attained the very summit of human power and prosperity. One of his panegyrists, M. Michel Chevalier, at that time uttered a sentence extravagant at best, but still, such was the wide-spread belief in his Majesty's genius, activity, and authority, that such a sentence could for the first time be uttered in France without exposing the speaker to the common ridicule of not merely Paris, but the whole French nation. "Talk of Napoleon the Great!" exclaimed M. Chevalier, "I tell you it is Napoleon the Great who lives in the Tuileries. It is Napoleon the Little who stands on the column in the Place Vendôme." A few months later the reader of the principal English organs of public opinion might learn on their unanimous testimony that the Emperor Napoleon, in the week when the Emperor of Austria ceded Venetia to him, had attained the pinnacle of imperial majesty, and was in very truth the arbiter of Europe. Yet, at that very moment, the line was drawn—"Thus far shalt thou go, no farther." France had in a moment become consciously inferior in power to Prussia. Count Bismarck refused to allow the interference of the Emperor in the settlement of the terms of

peace. The government of Florence refused to consider the cession of Venetia as a valid act, and continued to push on its beggarly hostilities against the retiring Austrians, until it got orders from Berlin to desist. The Emperor so handled that unique and magnificent position as to gain the goodwill neither of Prussia, nor of Italy, nor of Austria. The one concession which Count Bismarck in his generosity flung to him was a promise about the people of Northern Schleswig; and as that statesman was pleased to explain elaborately very lately, that was only a promise, and a Prussian promise, to be interpreted with convenient "latitude." No wonder, that when the Emperor, soon after the peace of Nickolsburg, went to Vichy in ill health, men began to believe his *rôle* was nearly played out; and have felt ever since that he is suffering in health and troubled in mind, because in his soul he well knows that his star is setting and why it is setting. The man who believes that God has given to him a mission is only safe in fulfilling it, and will be in so far safe though it hailed bomb-shells. Safe, according to no ever-so-perfect contrivances of mere human cunning, can he be; and the truth is, that the Emperor's life is probably less secure from those whom we may call his personal enemies than it was ten years ago. It is a significant fact that at the very moment when he held Venetia in trust for the Italians last summer, a most formidable Italian conspiracy against his life was discovered by one of the German princes.

The French army having abandoned Rome, the Papacy stands face to face with the Revolution, with the Government of the Kingdom of Italy looking on, waiting patiently in the assured hope that the whole gains and glory of whatever may happen, must of mere necessity fall to its share. We have not had long to wait for a frank and explicit programme of the policy of the Revolution. Joseph Mazzini has spoken—Joseph Mazzini, Deputy of the Italian Kingdom thrice elected, at last accepted for the city of Messina, but who will not deign to take his seat on the benches of Parliament, nor condescend to accept the amnesty offered to him by King Victor Emmanuel. A very slight acquaintance with the policy of Mazzini, steadily pursued for the last thirty years at least, is necessary to understand the value which he has always set upon the possession of the City of Rome by the Revolution; and a very striking exegetic commentary upon the doctrine is found in the obstinately continued attempts of his disciples to destroy the life of the Emperor Napoleon, because he was the great obstacle thereto. The possession of the City of Rome was, in his opinion, always the cardinal point of the true national policy. Why? Because it was not enough to make Italy one and free. That was only

the first step of the Italian Revolution. For that purpose, for the purpose of achieving the mere material unity of the country, Mazzini had always declared that dukes and grand dukes, kings and emperors, the Pope himself even, if possible, might be used; but beyond that period came the still more important one, the period of a new spiritual unity, established at Rome, and of which Italy should, after destroying Catholicism and abolishing the Papacy, assume the initiative. A generation of Italian infants has grown to manhood since Mazzini wrote these words, for which he now believes that at last the supreme hour of fulfilment or of frustration has actually come:—

Two great epochs govern the history of the progressive civilization of Europe, and at the head of these two epochs Italy appears as the initiatrix, being the only land for which the tomb has become the cradle of a more splendid resurrection. At the first epoch, during which the idea of liberty developed itself, Italy of the Roman Empire prepared the triumph with the potency of conquests: at the second, when the idea of equality was elaborated, Italy of the Popes made one wide level with the word of religious authority. A third epoch is now rising over Europe, the epoch of association; Italy of the people—of the people associated in a compact of love, a fraternal compact formed between free and equal citizens,—will be in virtue of example its initiatrix and mistress! From Rome, from the eternal city, issued the fiat of the Empire; from Rome sprang the Apostleship of the Popes; from Rome will spread, in spite of everything that can be done to diminish the immense destinies of Italy, the word of universal fraternity and of concord in the labours of the nations—Rome being by a law of Providence chief of the world.”*

Again in his letter to Pio Nono (1847), he says, “I believe in a third manifestation of the Italian mind; I believe that another European world must issue from the Eternal City, which had the Capitol and which has the Vatican.” In more recent writings, especially in the *Iniziativa Rivoluzionaria dei Popoli* (1852), he indicates his meaning more clearly. “Catholicism,” he says in one place, “is dead, but you who keep watch upon its tomb, know that Catholicism is but a sect, an erroneous application; the materialism of Christianity. The Catholic creed must disappear before the progress of intelligence, and under the strokes of ridicule.” And again, “Catholicism is nothing more than a dead body galvanized.” And again, “The Italian people are called to destroy Catholicism in the name of continued revelation.” And in his *Condizioni d'Europa* (1852), “Europe has lost all faith in Catholicism, and no

* *Prose*, p. 336.

longer recognizes in it the right, the mission, or the capacity of spiritual direction and education." The many subscribers and sympathizers whom he has found in England are probably unaware that he has no better opinion of Protestantism; but he had previously said, "Protestantism is based upon a narrow principle; it leads to the abuse of individualism and the denial of all authority; it is split into a thousand sects, all founded on the right of individual conscience, all madly warring against each other and perpetuating an anarchy of creeds, the true and only source of the discord, which socially and politically torment all Europe." It is an entirely new religion in fact, and not any form even of Christianity, that the new Prophet declares must now come from Rome. Of our Divine Lord, he has more than once blasphemously spoken as "A philosopher named Christ."

By the light of passages such as these, we are now the better able to understand the true sense of the Proclamation which he has just issued "To the Roman People," and of which we find an authorized version in the *Morning Star* of December 27:—

I know not, he begins, what you may intend to do under the present circumstances, but I know what you *ought* to do, and I take upon myself to tell you this: first, from a sense of my duty as an Italian and Roman citizen—since in days glorious for your city it pleased you to make me such; second, because the monarchical party have lately endeavoured to impose upon you as mine a stupid letter preaching patience to you, and stigmatizing as "imprudent" the glorious deeds of Rome in 1849. Some among you may possibly have believed in the reality of that forgery, and it is important to me that you should know that I—once Triumvir of Rome, and now grey-headed, but not grey-souled—have ever preserved uncontaminate the faith which we—then united and strong in will—announced to Italy from the Capitol. I know not what unforeseen situation you may be placed in by the tortuous tactics of the Government of the Kingdom of Italy, and their plots with French or Papal agents, and I trust you will act with dignity in any case; but I address you now, taking the Franco-Italian Convention as the basis upon which to judge your position. In the face of that Convention, which binds the Italian Government neither to promote nor tolerate any attempt against the temporal power of the Pope, and to maintain Florence as the capital of Italy,—you have before you two solemn duties: the first towards Rome, and towards yourselves who bear her sacred name—the second towards Italy and Europe.

It is your duty to ACT—to rise up against the ignoble horde, the refuse of other lands, and to drive them out.

He then proceeds to vindicate the Romans from the charge of cowardice, which he says has frequently been made against them by the French and English press of late. But he says

there is after all only one real answer to the imputation. Romans must not—he will not say *be* cowards—they must not even be suspected of cowardice. Their one only right and proper policy is to re-proclaim the Roman Republic:—

On the 2nd of July (1849) the free expression of your will and of your right was put down by brute force. That obstacle is now withdrawn. The manifestation of your will recommences at the point where it was interrupted. Your eternal right revives. By rising now you are what you were on the 9th of February—REPUBLICANS AND YOUR OWN MASTERS. On the 3rd of July—one day after the entrance of the French—the Roman people, in the face of its enemies, once more raised its hand in affirmation of its faith; the Republican constitution was read aloud to the multitude from the Capitol. The foreign flag was interposed to veil from Italy the hand that held the Pact aloft. That veil is rent asunder, and the hand of the Roman people reappears, raised on high. This is the programme pointed out to you by logic, honour, conscience, and duty towards the past and towards the future. You are bound, before all things, to re-assert yourselves, your own life, your own power. That done, you will act as God and the sense of your national duty inspire. First exist; then dispose of yourselves. Then, and then only, when your votes will not be as the blind, mute, hurried suffrages which inaugurated the Bonapartist tyranny and consigned Nice to France—when that vote may go forth, solemn, deliberate, powerful in collective inspiration, and enlightened by the counsels of your best men in free discussion of your position and that of Italy—you will decide whether Rome ought to give herself, like a secondary city, and disinherited of all life of her own, to a monarchy already doomed—a monarchy proved impotent and incapable of all noble action; a monarchy which has accepted Venice as an alms from the foreigner, and would inscribe “Lissa” and “Custoza” upon the Capitol—or whether the tradition, glorious beyond all others, of her past, and that mission which has twice given moral and material unity to the world, do not call her to a part nobler, worthier, and more fruitful of glory to the nation.

He explains, then, why in 1859 and 1860 he had counselled annexation to Piedmont in Central and in Southern Italy, and why he will not now apply the same rule to the case of Rome. At that time the material unity of the country did not exist. It was opposed to “all the designs of Bonaparte.” It was necessary in the first place to give it effect. Moreover, all Italy was agreed, “whether wisely or not, to give monarchy the benefit of the experiment.” And then the cities and provinces, which he counselled, “in reverence for the sovereignty of the popular will,” to vote for annexation to Piedmont, “bore not the grand name of Rome.” Those provinces now regret, however,—and this is too true even for a proclamation of Mazzini, “now repent having given themselves so blindly.” But he continues:—

The state of things in which I address you, Romans, is radically different. The material unity of Italy is henceforth irrevocably founded, nor can it be

delayed or endangered by your decision. The important question now is, not whether you be united to Italy upon this or that day, but that you be so in a manner worthy of Rome, tending to elevate the destiny of Italy and to promote that moral unity which is yet unaccomplished, and which the monarchy is incapable of accomplishing. The experiment has been fully tried. A long series of incontrovertible facts has proved to all possessed of heart and intellect that *the monarchy cannot be other than servile abroad and an instrument of repression at home. The institution is doomed.* The country may yet for awhile drag itself through the uncertainties of opportunism ; but *it is no longer monarchical.*

But I speak to you, Romans, of Rome ; an exception among all the cities of our Italy.

Rome is not a CITY ; Rome is an IDEA.

Rome is the sepulchre of two great religions, which have given life to the world in the past ; and Rome is the sanctuary of a third religion to come, and destined to give life to the world in the future. Rome represents the mission of Italy among the nations ; the WORD of our people ; the eternal gospel of unification to the peoples.

It is enough. Not all in vain have been the patient search and vigil long of this miserable man. Hunted and proscribed, an outlaw in every state of Europe except one, and a solitary in that, he has still achieved, not with the men or the means he would have chosen, nor at the time he would have fixed, but nevertheless he has achieved, all the great objects of his life, one alone excepted ; and probably he and his followers believe that he is on the eve of accomplishing that. Without a strongly organized revolutionary party in Italy audaciously daring in action, utterly unscrupulous in principle, thinking all means good that served its ends, equally ready to utter a lie or to stab a stranger for the sake of the cause, zealously propagandist and holding its power over its neophytes literally by a bond of blood—without such a revolutionary agency, the work of the last eight years could not have been done in eighty. Piedmont could not have done it, were her army twice as valiant, were her statesmen twice as wise ; Piedmont and France could not have done it, had not the invisible army of the Sect marched beforehand, stimulating the populace to fury sometimes, sometimes paralyzing it with terror. That army had the right to say even to France and Piedmont, what feat of arms was done in Lombardy like that which we unaided, with Garibaldi and a thousand men, did in Sicily ? Who took Bologna, Modena, Parma ? Above all, who forced the Emperor Napoleon to make war on Austria ? Who tore into shreds the treaty he made with Austria ? Who compelled him to be an accomplice to the gradual destruction of the Pontifical State—who has at last banished his flag from Rome ?

No one imagines that the little state of Piedmont effected these things, though up to the present time it has had all the profit and all the glory of them. But this work has been the work of the Revolution in Italy, which has sometimes used Piedmont, and sometimes, when Piedmont did not move fast enough, has acted of itself; and which for now nearly twenty years has known how to keep the life of the greatest potentate in Europe under a sentence of death, only to be stayed execution by absolute submission to its will. What then is the Revolution? Is it like Signor Mazzini's City of Rome "an idea"? In this country, men dislike abstractions; but the Revolution in Italy is not merely a moral essence, it is a palpable fact. It consists of thousands of men, perhaps hundreds of thousands, banded together in secret societies, solemnly sworn to devote their lives, in implicit obedience, to the destruction of the civil and spiritual institutions under which they were born. A secret society is a terrible engine. One lodge of twenty Ribandmen will suffice to keep a whole Irish county in a state of utter terror. The Fenian organization, which is but a pale copy, and as yet very imperfectly developed, of the great Italian system, is nevertheless powerful enough, simply from its secrecy and the unscrupulousness which that secrecy implies, to force the English Government to act in Ireland as if the whole population were hostile to its rule—to suspend the liberties of the Constitution, and shut up in gaol or send out of the country without any trial persons who fall under suspicion; to cram the island with troops and surround its coasts with squadrons; to examine correspondence passing through the Post Office, and even, on occasion, messages sent by telegraph; to refuse to call out the local militia, or allow the superior classes to form volunteer corps; to give the utmost latitude that can be conceived to the principle of government by police—yet be unable to lay hands on the principal organizer of the conspiracy or ascertain in what part of the world he really is, or what he means, or to stay the spirit of the organization, or force it to any tangible issue which could be laid hold of and dealt with once for all, so as to have an end there and then of this sort of everlasting *cauchemar d'état*. This was not very unlike the position of the Neapolitan and Modenese governments twenty years ago, with the difference that the principle and practice of political assassination do not appear to be of the essence of the Irish as they are of the Italian political conspiracy. Yet even an openly preached and steadily practised policy of assassination did not repel the sympathies of the English people from the cause of the Revolution in Italy. It was never admitted as an

excuse for the arbitrary measures employed in Italy, that a king had been fired at from the ranks by a conspirator in the disguise of his own body-guard during a royal review; that another sovereign prince had been stabbed to the heart in the streets of his own capital; that a prime minister of eminent abilities and of admittedly the purest personal character had also been stabbed to the heart in broad day in the midst of a crowd, who no more attempted to arrest the assassin than the Irish populace of Louth or of Tipperary would in old times attempt to arrest a Ribandman who had shot a landlord. It is much to be wondered what would be the feeling of the British nation towards Fenianism if such were the conditions of life it imposed at the Palace, at Dublin Castle, in Downing Street; and if President Johnson's life were besides constantly attempted because he would not sustain the Fenian policy in Canada. It is a parallel not inapposite. But what are the Irish secret societies to the Italian? A feeble imitation as yet, a mere series of germs and formulas. But during the last forty years Italy has been honeycombed from end to end with secret societies. And if Fenianism can be, as the English Government appear to think, but perhaps erroneously, reduced by process of ultimate analysis to James Stephens, much more surely can the Italian Revolution, taken all in all, be allowed to personify itself in Joseph Mazzini. The creation and direction of secret societies has been the work of his life; and their end, proclaimed from the first, has been, first to effect the unity of Italy and its freedom from foreign control, which are now said to be achieved; and secondly, to abolish the Papacy, extinguish the Catholic religion, and establish at Rome a new revelation in its stead.

And here one is tempted to ask what have the sovereigns and statesmen who have made themselves the instruments and accessories of the Revolution gained thereby? Mazzini twice says in the course of his Proclamation to the Romans, that the monarchy of Italy is "doomed;" and it is not the first time that he has doomed a monarchy. "Sire, be so good as to consider your monarchy doomed!" And this in answer to an amnesty—and this amnesty accorded to the man who once armed an assassin to attempt the life of his Majesty's own father, and who has not ceased to boast of having done so down to the very latest edition of his works! Europe has had very grievous reason to know what Mazzini means when he dooms a monarchy, and no reason to suppose that he has altered either his principles or his policy. Formerly, there were a certain number of obstacles between the Revolution and its ends. The Emperor Napoleon and King Victor

Emmanuel were so dealt with that they removed these obstacles one by one ; and the Revolution spared them for the time, and even seemed to accept their services as a condonation for past cause of complaint. But now it would appear the only remaining obstacles in the way of the Revolution are the monarchs themselves. And accordingly, first of all the Italian monarchy is "doomed." On the other hand, is there any evidence from end to end of the Proclamation that "Bonaparte," as he is contemptuously called, has been forgiven? Not a syllable. It is to be remembered too that the Revolution is now for the first time face to face with its real object—with that grand end to which annexations and assassinations were alike mere preliminaries, and means of "opportunism." It is question now of the resurrection of the Roman Republic. It is question of the abolition of the Roman Catholic Church. Is it likely that at such a moment the party of the Revolution will shrink from any act howsoever desperate? Is the life of Ricasoli more precious than that of Rossi, of Victor Emmanuel more sacred than that of Charles Albert, of "Bonaparte" now than it was before Orsini was guillotined? Alas, revolutions no more than rivers, retire to their beds at imperial bidding ; and what further revelation awaits the world on its arrival at Rome, who shall dare to dream? But woe to those who, having aided and abetted it hitherto, attempt to interfere with it now! The sentiments of the Mountain towards the Gironde were but a faint illustration of what the Revolution which has produced, or been produced by characters like Mazzini, Garibaldi, Orsini, will feel, if the sovereigns whom it has hitherto compelled, presume to check its farther advance. The Revolution has succeeded in alienating the monarchies from the Church. So much the worse for the monarchies. The real strength of the Church at this moment is that her support is altogether invisible and inscrutable ; and that so this age is doomed to witness another terrific illustration of the difference that Providence draws between Policy and Faith. It is a safe thing to say that it is much more likely Louis Napoleon may die a lunatic in Bicêtre, and his son be a humble student of Propaganda ten years hence ; that Victor Emmanuel may, in his last sad shabby days, become a colonel of Cossacks, and his kingdom, now apparently so compact and complete, be smashed, like a nut in the nut-crackers, into smaller principalities than Parma, ruled by stricter governments than Modena ; that Mazzini may die by the dagger of his most intimate associate, and Garibaldi, smitten by a miracle of grace, some day suddenly abandon Caprera for La Trappe. It is much more probable that any one or all of these eminently

improbable things should happen, than that any single one of the speculations which at present prevail in the world with regard to the forthcoming fate of the Papacy should turn out to be true. And in his heart of hearts, every enemy of the Papacy, who is not a mere case-hardened idiot, knows it—knows it is much less possible to destroy or to even hamper or cripple that awful and beautiful power, than it would be to blow the planet Jupiter out of the Solar System with powder and ball.

We are indebted to Signor Mazzini for the programme of the Revolution; Baron Ricasoli is good enough to furnish that of the kingdom of Italy. The two documents appear side by side in the English press on the same day, and so seem to challenge contrast. The Baron invites the bishops now in exile to return to their sees, but on the condition of accepting the fact that the Italian Government, as a government, is no longer a Catholic or even a Christian government. The President of the Council of his Italian Majesty holds up the Government of the United States to the bishops so long exiled from their cathedrals, as a model of what the relations of Church and State in a free country ought to be, in these words:—

The Government, therefore, no less earnestly than your lordships, desires that Italy may very soon enjoy the magnificent and imposing religious spectacle now afforded to the free citizens of the United States of America by the National Council of Baltimore, wherein religious doctrines are freely discussed, and whose decisions, approved by the Pope, will be proclaimed and executed in every town and village without *exequatur* or *placita*.

I therefore beg your lordships to consider that it is liberty which has produced this admirable spectacle; liberty professed and respected by all, in principle and in fact, in its amplest application to civil, political, and social life. In the United States every citizen is free to follow the persuasion that he may think best, and to worship the Divinity in the form that may seem to him most appropriate. Side by side with the Catholic Church rise the Protestant temple, the Mussulman mosque, the Chinese pagoda. Side by side with the Romish clergy the Genevan consistory and the Methodist assembly discharge their office. This state of things generates neither confusion nor clashing. And why is this? Because no religion asks either special protection or privileges from the State. Each lives, develops, and is followed under the protection of the common law, and the law, equally respected by all, guarantees to all an equal liberty.

Passing for a moment the question whether the Government of the United States ought to be, in the region of the relation of Church and State, regarded as the model for a Catholic statesman, let us wonder with Oxenstiern at the little wisdom with which kingdoms are governed, when we find such argu-

ments and such assertions coupled together in an important despatch. Is it true, for example, that the Mahometan and the Chinese stand in the United States on the same level in point of religious liberty as the Catholic, the Calvinist, Methodist, or other Protestant? Certainly not. Christianity is in the United States, as in England, a part of the common law of the land. The pagan citizen of the United States is tolerated in the exercise of his religion in so far as it does not conflict with the settled law and customs of Christian civil life. But take the most characteristic institution of the Mahometan sect,—polygamy, Does any one imagine that the American law would sanction an American Mahometan marrying four wives at once, and establishing the institution of the harem in Boston or Philadelphia? Yet it is impossible to say that a Mahometan enjoys religious liberty, according to his ideas, in any country where he is not permitted to practise polygamy, and to subject the females of his family to a rule of life utterly incompatible with the civil law which has sprung from Christianity. A Chinese considers himself at perfect liberty to commit infanticide, yet in the United States he is held bound, under the severest penalty, to act as if he believed in the Christian theory of the relation of parent and child. The Mahometan, Confucian, or Buddhist religion is, in fact, tolerated in the United States in so far as it does not directly conflict with the standard of life set up by Christianity. The practice of the most characteristic, and therefore, to its votaries, probably the dearest doctrines of any Paganism, leads in the United States possibly to the gallows, at all events to the treadmill, and, failing that, to tar and feathers. In one respect, however, which he has not unadvisedly overlooked, the United States might afford a model of religious liberty to Baron Ricasoli. The United States, though colonized originally from a Protestant country by violent Protestant sectaries, has never thought it necessary to plunder the Catholic Church, to suppress religious orders, and seize their endowments on the score of the liberty of worship, and to evict venerable priests and holy nuns by the thousand from the retreats where they had hoped to enjoy the modest security and long repose of the monastic life. No American statesman, even in the terrific strain which the civil war imposed on the resources of the Republic, was found so destitute of conscience as to propose a spoliation of the Catholic Church in the States, like that which the Government of Florence has just effected. And now, after having achieved this unblest task, Baron Ricasoli has the effrontery to address the exiled bishops with the request that they will return to their sees,—and enjoy American liberty!

After a glowing description of the position of the Church in "those virgin regions," he continues in a passage whose detestable hypocrisy and stealthy animosity against the Catholic religion are hardly masked:—

But while the world, emerging from the chaos of the Middle Ages, re-entered the path of progress marked out by God, the Church impressed upon all having any relation with it the immobility of the dogma intrusted to its guardianship. It viewed with suspicion the growth of intelligence, and the multiplication of social forces, and declared itself the enemy of all liberty, denying the first and most incontestable of all,—the liberty of conscience. Hence arose the conflict between the ecclesiastical and the civil power, since the former represented subjection and immobility, and the latter liberty and progress. The conflict, from peculiar circumstances, has greater proportions in Italy, because the Church, thinking that a kingdom was necessary to the independent exercise of its spiritual ministry, found that kingdom in Italy. The ecclesiastical power, from the same reason, is here in contradiction not only with the civil power but national right. From these causes originated the distrust and precaution described in my circular, which provoked your censure, but which were only dictated by necessity. The bishops cannot be considered among us as simple pastors of souls, since they are at the same time the instruments and defenders of a power at variance with the national aspirations. The civil power is therefore constrained to impose those measures upon the bishops which are necessary to preserve its rights and those of the nation. How is it possible to terminate this deplorable and perilous conflict between the two powers—between Church and State? Liberty can alone bring us to that happy state of things which your lordships consider so enviable in America. Let us render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's, and peace between Church and State will be troubled no more.

In order to compose this passage, Baron Ricasoli appears to have gone to the Syllabus of Condemned Propositions attached to the Encyclical *Quantâ curâ*. Sentence by sentence it seems to be taken from the sections *Indifferentismus*, *Latitudinarismus*; *Erroreres de Ecclesia ejusquejuribus*; *De Societate Civili*; *De Civili Romani Pontificis Principatu*; *De Liberalismo hodierno*; and whatever is not condemned as theological error is false in historical point of fact. That an Italian gentleman, not to say statesman, should be so ignorant of the history of his country as to describe in such terms the attitude of the Church in the Middle Ages, is a fact that may be left to excite the astonishment of even ordinarily well-informed Protestant scholars; but beyond the malignity and the ignorance of the passage, it has an object of policy. It is the first step of the Government of Florence in sequence of the execution of the Convention of September. The bishops are

told that, as in Italy, differently from other countries, the Church thinks a kingdom necessary to the independent exercise of its ministry, for that reason "the ecclesiastical power is here in contradiction, not only with the civil power, but national right. * * * The bishops cannot be considered among us as simple pastors of souls, since they are at the same time the defenders of a power at variance with the national aspirations;" this power being, of course, no other than the civil sovereignty of the Papacy. Victor Emmanuel therefore, as successor and representative of Nero and Helio-gabalus, demands the restoration of the capital of the Cæsars; and, after that, he and Baron Ricasoli will "render unto God the things that are God's." It makes one think of the cry of the Italian Saint, "Alas, poor God Almighty!" Yet surely these men must sometimes feel, darkened as their intellects, false and base as their hearts evidently are, that the hour of Divine vengeance cannot be much longer postponed.

"The Revolution will come to the Capitol, but near to the Capitol is the Tarpeian Rock." Such is the foreboding, such the warning of the Pope, and every word of it is confirmed by the programme of the Revolution and by the programme of the Government of Florence. Hitherto they have been combined, and their combination has been strong enough to alter the whole face of Italy. Kings and princes fell before it; the Emperor was forced from one point to another, cowed, check-mated, coerced: the Pope alone stands face to face with the deadly danger, serene, unmoved, unyielding. We can do little, save aid him by our prayers and our alms; but let us do that freely. The year that has begun commences, in all probability, a period far more critical in the history of the Papacy than any of us can even now venture to conceive; but we live in the assured hope and confirmed conviction that that period will end in the mutual destruction of its enemies, and in a triumph of the Church manifest to all mankind.

APPENDIX TO THE OCTOBER ARTICLE ON MARIAN DOCTRINE.

WE return briefly to a little matter of domestic controversy, on which we touched in our last number. Dr. Pusey alleges, that various approved Catholic writers maintain the co-presence of our Blessed Lady in the Eucharist. We admitted in reply that *Oswald* maintained this; but added

that his work was at once placed on the Index. As to those other writers cited by Dr. Pusey, we pointed out that he had confused this tenet with another which differs from it in every relevant particular. Various Catholics have held that "a certain portion of matter, which *once* belonged to the Blessed Virgin, now belongs unchanged to her Son; and is, therefore, of course present in the Eucharist" (p. 492). To this opinion indeed F. Faber somewhat inclined. "There seems, however, much reason for thinking," we added (p. 493), "that even this opinion has been authoritatively censured." We were not at all aware, when we so wrote, that no less an authority than Suarez holds this very doctrine. The fact, however, is indubitable, and we quote his words in a note.* F. Lallemand, S.J., that eminent ascetical writer, expresses his own assent also to Suarez's doctrine (*Doctrine Spirituelle*, princ. 6, sec. 1, c. 4, a. 3, p. 258 of English translation). This circumstance greatly increases the doubt which we expressed in October, whether the view can really have been condemned; though Benedict XIV., writing as a private theologian, seems (as we understand him) to have thought so. We much hope that some competent theologian will investigate the matter.

* Secundò, hinc factum est ut aliqua substantia virginei corporis, ex quâ fuit Christi corpus et in principio constitutum et postea auctum quamdiu sanguine vel lacte matris nutritum fuit, unita sit hypostaticè Verbo Dei. Propterea dixit Petrus Damianus, Serm. de Nativitate Mariæ: "Cum Deus in aliis rebus sit tribus modis, in Virgine fuit quarto speciali modo, scilicet, per identitatem, quia Idem est quod ipsa. Hinc taceat et contremiscat omnis creatura: et quis audeat aspicere tantæ dignitatis immensitatem?" Et August., Serm. de Assumpt. Virgin., c. 5: "Caro," inquit, "Christi, caro est Mariæ;" et infra: "Caro Christi, quamvis gloriâ Resurrectionis fuerit magnificata, eadem tamen mansit quæ suscepta est de Mariâ." Ex quo potest facile et credi illam substantiam carnis, quam Christus assumpsit ex Virgine, *nunquam fuisse omnino dimissam aut continuâ caloris naturalis actione resolutam, sed eandem omnino fuisse semper conservatam Verbo Dei unitam.* Quod partim physicâ ratione, partim probabili conjecturâ fit verisimile. Illa enim substantia carnis ex purissimis Virginis sanguinibus desumpta fuit, et optimè disposita, et in mediocri quantitate. Rursus in tempore infantie, quia alimentum est facile, et ferè sine resistentiâ convertitur, parùm illius substantiæ per ejus actionem resolvitur: præsertim in Christo, Qui temperatissimo et convenientissimo cibo alebatur; scilicet, ubere de cœlo pleno, ut Ecclesia canit. De reliquo autem tempore vitæ Christi fit non dissimilis conjectura. Quia totum illud fuit tempus augmenti, aut statûs, in quo humidum radicale ferè integrum perseverat, nullâ illius resolutione factâ. Probabile denique est, ex speciali providentiâ et voluntate Ipsius Christi hoc fieri potuisse.—*Suarez, De Mysteriis*, disp. 1, sect. ii. 2.

Notices of Books.

*Sanctissimi Domini nostri Pii Divinâ Providentiâ Papæ IX. Allocutiones
habite in Consistorio Secreto die 29^o Octobris, 1866.*

IT is a sublime and touching fact that Pius IX.—in the very crisis of his civil sovereignty—his whole earthly future trembling in the balance—deserted by every human power—should have put forth these two noble Allocutions, breathing the very spirit of tranquil trust in God. And it signally exemplifies the odious unfairness of party spirit, that no portion of the Protestant press (Tory or Whig) has had one word of admiration for so magnificent a spectacle. We will not here, however, enlarge further on this theme; but will draw attention to three different pronouncements contained in these Allocutions, which will possess interest for many of our readers. And, firstly, on his civil sovereignty:—

“All men are aware with how great zeal the bishops of the Catholic world have defended, both in word and writing, the civil principedom appertaining to Us and to this Apostolic See; and have declared that the same principedom, especially in the world's present condition, is *absolutely necessary* (necessarium omnino) for the purpose of protecting and securing that full liberty of the Roman Pontiff, in feeding the whole Catholic flock, which is evidently conjoined with the liberty of the whole Church.”

In July, 1864 (p. 218), we drew attention to F. Steccanella's work on the Pope's civil sovereignty. That Papal dictum which he particularly selected, as expressing most clearly the Catholic doctrine on this head, was Pius IX.'s public declaration (“*palam edicimus*” were the Pope's words) that “the civil principedom is necessary to this Holy See, in order that it may exercise its sacred power for the good of religion without any impediment.” All will at once recognize the close similarity between that dictum and the present; while, at the same time, there is one curious variety between the two occasions. F. Steccanella drew attention to the assent subsequently expressed by the Catholic Episcopate, as proving that the Papal dictum had been *ex cathedrâ*. In the present instance, we may draw the same conclusion from the converse fact; from the Pope's own expression of agreement with the Catholic Episcopate. There would, of course, be no meaning in his reference to such agreement, unless the Pope had declared the Catholic doctrine in his capacity of Universal Teacher.

We have heard of one or two Catholics, who shrink from the supposition that a declaration so solemnly uttered can possibly be mistaken; and who are, nevertheless, unwilling to accept it in its obvious sense. They raise (what we

must call) cavils on the word "necessary." "Can Pius IX. be understood to "mean," they ask, "that God could not, in the resources of His Providence, find some other way for securing the due ecclesiastical liberty of a Pope "who should have lost his civil principedom? Surely, Pius IX. can only "intend that this principedom is necessary, until some other satisfactory "method is provided; and we may piously believe that God will very "soon provide such a method, if He thinks fit to overthrow the "principedom." It is strange to our mind that any candid person can misapprehend the Pontiff's meaning. Of course, no one but a heretic can think that this civil principedom is necessary to the Church's *existence*: the Pope only declares it necessary to her healthy and normal condition. Nor, again, would any one think of denying that God might exercise a quasi-miraculous intervention; that if the Holy Father were living in another monarch's dominions, God might so guide the heart of that monarch and his successors, as to prevent them from interfering in any way with Papal liberty of action. But, then, it is obvious that a continued quasi-miraculous intervention of this kind is entirely alien to the ordinary course of God's Providence; and that, in the present instance, He has given us no reason whatever to expect it. Nor, lastly, is it impossible that, in the course of many centuries, a new state of society may arise unlike anything of which we can now form any conception; and that in this new state of society there may be other means for attaining satisfactorily the desired end. Evidently what the Pope does say is, that while society remains substantially in its present condition, and putting aside the utterly unfounded hope of a quasi-miraculous intervention, there is no satisfactory security for ecclesiastical liberty except the Pope's civil sovereignty. To this doctrine, as the Pope now declares and as is indeed notorious, the Episcopate has assented; and even on Gallican principles, therefore, every Catholic is required to accept it with interior belief as infallibly true.

The second pronouncement to which we would draw attention, concerns the obligation incumbent on all civil rulers to aim at their people's spiritual good. This, of course, has been the Church's consistent doctrine from the first; but it has, perhaps, never before been so urgently set forth as on the present occasion.

"And here, in virtue of our office, we cannot but earnestly beseech in the Lord all supreme princes and other rulers of nations, that they would at length understand and sedulously consider *the most grave duty* by which they are bound, of taking care that the love and practice of religion be increased in [their respective] peoples; and of labouring *with their whole strength* that the light of faith be not extinguished in the same peoples. But *woe to those rulers* who, forgetting that they are God's ministers for good, have neglected to do this when they can and ought: and let them exceedingly fear and tremble; especially when by their co-operation they destroy the most precious treasure of that Catholic Faith, without which it is impossible to please God. For when they undergo a *most severe judgment* before the tribunal of Christ, they will see how fearful a thing it is to fall into the hands of the Living God, and to experience His most severe justice."

It is sometimes asked, in what respect the end of civil society can differ from that of the Church, if the civil ruler (no less truly than the ecclesiastical) is

obliged to aim at spiritual good. This is undoubtedly a matter which requires very careful examination. We treated it to the best of our power in July, 1863 (pp. 74-78, 220-223). We submit to the judgment of theologians the whole view which we there expressed.

The third pronouncement to which we referred at starting concerns the Polish rebellion. The Holy Father expresses with great vigour his utter disapproval of that sinful movement ; a vigour the more remarkable, because of those very severe accusations against Russia which form the main staple of his Allocution :—

“ We are not ignorant (he says) that it was from a *most fatal and in every respect condemnable rebellion*, that the same [Russian] Government seized the opportunity to carry out such pernicious counsels against the Catholic Church : whereas those guilty of rebellion might have been restrained and chastised by due methods, without any such grievous war being waged against the Church. And would it had pleased God that no one, especially from among the Church's ministers, had mixed himself up with the most pernicious proceedings of such a movement ! We indeed once more, as at other times also, must most absolutely condemn and reprobate rebellion ; and admonish and exhort all the faithful, especially ecclesiastics, to abhor from their heart the impious principles of rebellion, and be subject to the higher powers, and obey them faithfully in all those things which are not opposed to the laws of God and of His holy Church.”

It is most honourable to the *Tablet* newspaper that it has at once, on learning this judgment of the Holy Father, retracted its previous defence of the Polish rebellion ; and we have heartily to thank its editor for setting this admirable example to Catholic writers. For ourselves, so far back as October, 1864 (p. 343, note), we protested against the attempt made by various continental journals to represent the Pope as having expressed approval of the insurrection : while at a still earlier period we expressed our own hearty dislike of its principles (October, 1863 ; pp. 584-592).

Pastoral Letter to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of Westminster. By

HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster.

The Temporal Power of the Pope in its Political Aspect. By HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster. London : Longman.

The Pope and the Revolution. A Sermon preached in the Oratory Church, Birmingham, on Sunday, October 7, 1866. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D. London : Longman.

PREVIOUSLY to the Pope's Allocution, the Irish bishops, and afterwards the English, respectively appointed fixed days for united prayer in the Holy Father's behalf. The above (we believe) are the only publications which have been the result. The first of these, being an Episcopal Pastoral, is of course above our criticism ; but we will present our readers with two extracts from it, italicizing a word or two of the former on our own responsibility :—

"To the *peaceful* exercise of this personal independence, a sphere and a throne are necessary. For he who is independent is sovereign; and sovereignty excludes all superiors. But such is the order which the will of God has ordained for the Vicar of Christ in Rome and its provinces; and this is what men call his Temporal Power,—a providential order to secure *in peace* his personal freedom and supreme direction over the whole Church on earth" (p. 93).

"The line of Pontiff-Kings is not yet broken. It has endured changeless and immovable. But where is the Europe upon which S. Leo III., S. Greg. VII., or even Pius VI. and Pius VII. gazed? Pass over the mutations of centuries. In the last seventy years alone more than forty reigning families have been driven out by their people; at least thirty thrones have been overturned. The example of insubordination which Princes set to their people fostered and emboldened the Revolution. The storm has beaten hard upon the Pontiffs, but it has swept the earthly thrones away. So will it be again. It is hard to kick against the goad, harder still to smite themselves against the Rock" (p. 97).

The second publication named above is the Archbishop's sermon preached on the occasion. He dwells in it prominently (as its title implies) on the rights accruing to the Pope, from the general principles of civil obedience; and he thus, in some sense, combines the doctrine of both the Papal Allocations. In our humble judgment his Grace has seldom been more successful. Not to dwell here on much other interesting matter, enforced with great power, we have nowhere seen the doctrine of civil obedience and of the civil ruler's divine right more satisfactorily set forth. Every reader will be struck by the great care, with which the Archbishop avoids every extreme statement, and expresses what we may call the two opposite poles of sound doctrine on the subject. On the one hand:—

"St. Paul declared that even the heathen empire of Rome was ordained by God, and that every one owed subjection to it. He laid it upon the conscience of Christians to obey it in all things lawful, 'not only for wrath,' that is, for fear of punishment, 'but also for conscience' sake.' And yet the empire of Rome was not only heathen, but persecuting. It was steeped in Christian blood. Nevertheless, he declares it to be a power constituted by God. As such, the Christians obeyed it with an obedience limited only by the divine law of faith. And this law of civil obedience is of universal and perpetual obligation. It is this on which, as subjects of the British Empire, we bear allegiance to our own Sovereign. As Catholics, we obey not for wrath only, but for conscience' sake; it is a part of our religion to be loyal: it is a dictate of our moral sense to be obedient to the law and faithful to the Throne. If it were not so, civil obedience would be degraded from its dignity as a moral virtue, and treason would be divested of its highest guilt (pp. 5, 6).

"The Temporal Power of the Popes is as manifestly and as fully ordained of God as the power of Queen Victoria. Neither the one nor the other came by *Plebiscite*, or universal suffrage, or votes of inorganic masses, but by the gradual and watchful providence of the Divine Author of human and political society. The British Empire succeeds to the Roman Empire in Britain by a direct law of Divine Providence. When the last Roman legion left the shores of Britain, it began to gravitate to a centre within itself. The British Empire of to-day is formed round that centre, and rests upon it. So, when the Emperor of Constantinople ceased to be able to protect Rome, the Vicar of Jesus Christ became its centre. The Emperor had ceased to rule, and the throne was vacant by the visitation of God. The Pontiffs reigned as pastors

and as rulers, and unconsciously and by force of necessity filled the vacant throne. They have reigned in Rome, first with an informal and pastoral sovereignty, and afterwards with a full and explicit sovereignty, from that time to this. On what ground then can obedience to the sovereignty of Great Britain be claimed, if obedience to the sovereignty of the Pontiff be denied? Every sanction of Divine Providence, and of Christian morals, and of political justice, confirms the Temporal Sovereignty of the Pope" (p. 7).

On the other hand :—

"I am not proclaiming what men are pleased to call the slavish doctrine of blind and immoral obedience. Rulers have their duties as well as their rights, and subjects have rights as well as duties. The ruler has a right to obedience, but he is bound by a duty to rule justly. The subject has a duty to obey, but he has also a right to justice. And the violation of the bond of their reciprocal duties is not only a crime, in both the ruler and the ruled, against society, which is an ordinance of God; but a sin against God, who is the supreme Author of society among men. It is not now the time, nor is it now my duty, to define the limits of this question, or to say when or where a rightful power abdicates its claim to obedience by abuse. Tyranny, as well as rebellion, is a crime and a sin, and both have their just correction. No power can be more absolute than the law 'thou shalt not kill,' and yet in defence of life both an individual and a nation may take the life of a murderer or of an invading power. I am not here at this time to discuss these limits. . . . It is enough for me to affirm that no Pontiff in the long line of a thousand, I may say of these fifteen hundred years, has ever abused his power, so as to relax the duty of obedience, or to purge the resistance of his subjects of the sin of rebellion. And this, which may be affirmed of the Pontiffs without fear, can be affirmed of no other line of rulers, of no other dynasty on earth" (pp. 16, 17).

Finally, the Archbishop touches on the objection to which we have already referred in our previous notice; viz., the inexhaustible resources of God's Providence :—

"It is no question of what God could do, or might do, or may do hereafter, for the future of the world. *We are as full of faith in the inexhaustible wisdom of Divine Providence as our adversaries*; but this we affirm, that it is by this twofold contact that the Church acts upon the Christianity and the civilization of mankind; that so long as Christianity acts alone, it acts upon individuals one by one, as in the ages before Constantine; that so soon as it acts upon races, legislatures, rulers, kingdoms, upon the public law and organic life of nations, the Temporal Power is its legitimate offspring and result. *To undo this, is to go backward, not onward.* It is to dissolve the work of Christianity upon the world, not to advance it; to pull down, not to build up, the intellectual and moral perfection of human society" (p. 20).

F. Newman's sermon contains many powerful passages, thought and expressed with his own peculiar felicity. We will give a few specimens of these. Thus there are various questions of ecclesiastical conduct and prudence, on which no one professes that the Holy Father is strictly infallible; but on which, nevertheless, every loyal Catholic, as a matter of course, gathers round the Pope's standard as being the very standard of Christ. How admirably this is expressed by F. Newman :—

VOL. VIII.—NO. XV. [*New Series.*]

Q

"What need I say more to measure our own duty to [the Holy See] and to him who sits in it, than to say that, in his administration of Christ's kingdom, in his religious acts, we must never oppose his will, or dispute his word, or criticise his policy, or shrink from his side ! There are kings of the earth who have despotic authority, which their subjects obey indeed and disown in their hearts ; but we must never murmur at that absolute rule which the Sovereign Pontiff has over us, because it is given to him by Christ, and, in obeying him, we are obeying his Lord. *We must never suffer ourselves to doubt, that, in his government of the Church, he is guided by an intelligence more than human.* His yoke is the yoke of Christ : he has the responsibility of his own acts, not we ; and to his Lord must he render account, not to us. Even in secular matters it is ever safe to be on his side, dangerous to be on the side of his enemies. Our duty is, not indeed to mix up Christ's Vicar with this or that party of men, because he in his high station is above all parties ; but to look at his acts, and to follow him, whither he goeth, and never to desert him, however we may be tried, but to defend him at all hazards, and against all comers, as a son would a father, and as a wife a husband, knowing that his cause is the cause of God. And so, as regards his successors, if we live to see them ; it is our duty to give them in like manner our dutiful allegiance and our unfeigned service, and to follow them also whithersoever they go, having that same confidence that each in his turn and in his own day will do God's work and will, which we felt in their predecessors, now taken away to their eternal reward" (pp. 10, 11).

Then, as to Pius IX.'s personal character :—

"He is one whom to see is to love ; one who overcomes even strangers, even enemies, by his very look and voice ; whose presence subdues, whose memory haunts, even the sturdy resolute mind of the English Protestant. Such is the Holy Father of Christendom, the worthy successor of a long and glorious line. Such is he ; and, great as he is in office, and in his beneficent acts and virtuous life, as great is he in the severity of his trials, in the complication of his duties, and in the gravity of his perils" (p. 16).

No argument is more prominently dwelt on by opponents of his civil sovereignty, than the injustice of sacrificing the temporal good of the Roman people to the Church's spiritual welfare. Never hitherto, perhaps, has this objection been so explicitly noticed and refuted as by F. Newman :—

"It is happier, I think, for the bulk of a people, to belong to a small State which makes little noise in the world, than to a large one. At least in this day we find small states, such as Holland, Belgium, and Switzerland, have special and singular temporal advantages. And the Roman people, too, under the sway of the Popes, at least have had a very easy time of it ; . . . The Romans have not had those civil inconveniences, which fall so heavy on the members of a first-class Power. The Pontifical Government has been very gentle with them ; but, if once they were joined to the kingdom of Italy, they would at length find what it is to attain temporal greatness. The words of Samuel to the Israelites would be fulfilled in them to the letter. Heavy taxes would be laid on them ; their children would be torn from them for the army ; and they would incur the other penalties of an ambition which prefers to have a share in a political adventure to being at the head of Catholic citizenship" (pp. 28, 29).

We would also draw particular attention to that admirable passage, in pp. 31, 32, where he enlarges on the prominent influence of Satan himself in

promoting the Revolution; and on the mistaken narrowness of those, who confine their views of that most anti-Christian movement to its political aspect. And he has been particularly happy in selecting (p. 46) Victor Emmanuel's proclamation of Sept. 11, 1860, as the best adducible illustration of that monarch's shameless and unscrupulous policy.

Notes on Doctrinal and Spiritual Subjects. By the late FREDERICK WILLIAM FABER, D.D., Priest of the Oratory of S. Philip Neri. Vol. II. "The Faith and the Spiritual Life." London: Richardson & Son. 1866.

IN our April number we welcomed the first volume of these Notes. A second has now appeared, and in no way falls short of the first in value or interest. We venture to think this collection will enjoy a popularity as great as that of the author's finished works. The form of notes will make it especially serviceable as a storehouse for meditation and sermons. It has all Father Faber's characteristic variety and richness of thought, and a surprising unity and completeness, when we remember that it consists of detached papers, ranging over a busy period of sixteen years. This merit is due, in great measure, to the careful and excellent arrangement of the Notes. They are classified, according to their subjects, in the order followed by Father Faber in his beautiful volume of hymns. The subjects treated of in the former volume were God, His Attributes, the Most Holy Trinity, the Sacred Humanity of Jesus, the Passion, our Blessed Lady, and the Saints. The present volume is occupied with the Church, the Sacraments, Controversy, the Spiritual Life, Miscellaneous Subjects, the Four Last Things, and Purgatory.

From this exhaustive catalogue of subjects it is to be presumed that we have no further papers to hope for; and few readers will lay down this volume without a keen regret at the thought that we have now seen all we are ever to possess from that gifted pen.

A glance at the table of contents shows that a large proportion, 155 pages, of the present volume is occupied with the Spiritual Life. We are particularly glad of this. Father Faber had a special gift for applying the ancient traditions of the Spiritual Life to the peculiar circumstances of Catholics in our country and in our time. The needs and temptations which beset the life of a cloistered religious must be very much the same in the 19th century and in the 9th. But the hurry and multiplicity and the restless, impetuous activity of human life in our day must evidently surround Christians endeavouring to sanctify themselves in the world with new and special dangers requiring also special treatment. No one can read Father Faber's writings on the Spiritual Life without seeing that he had a deep sense of the danger and of the corresponding need. This we venture to think one of the chief excellences of his works. It is powerfully expressed in the following passage from the "Notes":—

"The ordinary life of the present day seems almost an impossible life for the salvation of our souls. The strength of religion is in its simplicity. The

strength of worldliness is in its variety. Each succeeding age the world appears to acquire a new multiplicity. Knowledge multiplies it. Education multiplies it. It is multiplied by whatever makes it more rapid, and gives it a greater mastery over time. It is multiplied by whatever renders it more crowded and more diversified. If we know what is required for the salvation of a soul, even carrying laxity to the very limit of what is safe, and that itself would not be a very safe thing to do, we shall be exceedingly frightened if we look out upon the ordinary life of the present day."

And after a page of most vivid description of the harassing multiplicity of modern life:—

"There are so many things to see, so many things to hear, so many things to say, so many things to suffer, and so many things to do, that we become stupefied by trying to be active. What would we give if the planet and the whole thing might only stop for a few minutes till we had time to take breath, and look about us, and see where we are, and what is the next best thing to do." (Vol. ii. p. 161.)

We have taken this passage from a portion of the book which comes upon the reader as a very pleasant surprise. In the midst of the notes we are presented with forty-five pages of finished composition, consisting of two chapters on the "Fear of God" equal to anything Father Faber has written. The preface informs us that it was destined to form part of an intended volume of "Spiritual Conferences." It is a magnificent fragment, and wakes a sad sense of what was lost in Father Faber's death to the Church in England and throughout the world.

The detached sermons and courses are full of vigour and originality. They give a high idea of the care and accuracy with which Father Faber must have prepared his discourses, and which few who heard the easy and almost spontaneous flow of his beautiful language would have suspected. The conclusions of the sermons, which are frequently written out at length, are often strikingly beautiful.

A particular feature in the volume is the short series of papers on Old Testament subjects. It has given scope to the great power of scene-painting in words which was so characteristic of Father Faber. Here is the conclusion of a discourse on "Jonas and Ninive":—

"Let us go and linger in thought on the battle-field where man's submission defeated and disarmed the vengeance of his Creator. How mournfully, how desolately the evening comes among the treeless mounds of Ninive, scarred with excavations: the Tigris rushes by, half choked with the ruins of ancient causeways, hurrying its cold splashing waters as if it longed to be far away—and the coming out of those once worshipped stars is greeted now not by the idolatrous cadences of the dark priests on the watch-tower balconies, but by the long howl of the wild beasts, heard by none but the few marauding Arabs in their black tents, who are almost nocturnal beasts of prey themselves: yet to us with our faith, to Jonas looking out from the bosom of God over that faded turf and those tawny mounds, there lies, more than over any spot on earth but Calvary, the beautiful unfading splendour of the Divine Compassion, a gracious, pathetic disclosure of that all-powerful Creator who has no power to harden His heart against the humility of His frightened creatures!" (Vol. ii. p. 309.)

To those who had the privilege of knowing Father Faber, or hearing him week after week, these volumes will be particularly precious. They are not merely a relic, they are like an echo calling up the tones of that beautiful voice which those who have heard it will not easily forget. Through these pages, in the words of the happily-chosen motto on the title-page, "*defunctus adhuc loquitur.*"

The memoir of Father Faber, which was announced in the preface to the first volume, has not appeared ; but it is now promised as a separate volume. We must express our gratification at this change of plan. Father Faber's is a life which should be handled at greater length than would be possible in a memoir prefixed to a volume of "*Remains.*" His writings are spread far and wide in nearly every European tongue. They have become standard books in colleges, seminaries, and religious houses through the length and breadth of Christendom. The work he has done through them, and through his preaching and personal influence, must be incalculable ; we should only be echoing the voice of our Continental contemporaries, if we were to rank his influence upon the spirituality of his day with that of Fénelon and S. Francis of Sales. We trust, in the promised Life, to see his work, and especially his work in England, brought out and shown in its true proportions. Those, too, who know what his letters of spiritual direction were, and the amount of his correspondence, may well hope that in a detailed life some precious relics of this kind may find a place.

In conclusion, we must express our grateful sense of how much is due to Father Bowden for the care and labour bestowed on the work of editing these volumes : a labour probably far greater than appears when the work is done. The index added at the end, so much neglected by modern writers, and which so greatly enhances the value of a book, the pains taken to note, wherever practicable, the date of each sermon, and any other circumstance which might add to the interest of the particular paper, all show that it has been to him a labour of love.

Tractatus theologicus de Beatâ Mariâ Virgine. Auctore H. D. Societatis Mariæ Presbytero. Paris : Leclerc.

AT present no elementary course of theology contains a special treatise on the Blessed Virgin. We think the present treatise is admirably adapted, both to supply this want in the case of seminary students, and also to benefit many of the clergy, whose incessant occupations prevent them from studying the folios of the great theologians. It is founded chiefly on Suarez's matchless second volume on the Incarnation. But the author is no servile copyist and follower : on the contrary, he thinks for himself on each successive question which he treats ; while at the same time never failing to give full weight to theological authority of every kind. The method pursued by him is the scholastic : and yet (as is often indeed the case with scholastic writers) every sentence is animated with the warmest and tenderest piety : which in one sense impresses the reader even more, from the circumstance

of its expression being so chastened and subdued. The work displays no tendency to puerile and unfounded fancies; yet on the other hand it is conformable throughout with S. Alphonsus's golden rule, of ascribing to the Blessed Virgin every prerogative, resting on any solid ground, which *can* be ascribed to her without theological unsoundness.

In our October article concerning her, we referred to the tenet, that a certain portion of matter, which once belonged to her, now belongs unchanged to her Divine Son. We mention in another part of our present number, that this is Suarez's doctrine; but the present treatise actually accounts it "the common doctrine of theologians" (p. 32).

There is one peculiar advantage which theologians of this day possess over all their predecessors in writing on our Blessed Lady; and of which the treatise before us largely avails itself. We refer to the very large amount of doctrine contained in the Bull "*Ineffabilis*."

The treatise is divided into three parts: which treat respectively (1) the dignity of *Deipara*; (2) Mary's perfections; and (3) her offices towards mankind. This is an excellent division, and (we think) peculiar to our author. In executing his design, he has succeeded admirably in uniting the two opposite conditions of completeness and brevity.

We will conclude our imperfect notice with a beautiful sentiment quoted by the author from Suarez (p. 3):—"For myself," says that illustrious theologian, "next to the knowledge of God and of Christ, I think none is either more useful or more worthy of a theologian than that of the glorious Virgin. Nor do I understand why theologians dispute so accurately concerning the grace, merit, and glory of Angels, if far *more* diligent discussion be not given to the Queen of Angels: since this latter doctrine is in itself more worthy; and is more delightful; and is more suited to the promotion of piety." The Bull "*Ineffabilis*," however, will probably be the beginning of a new era in this respect; and we hope that this little work may herald other scholastic treatises, on the same subject, and on a much larger scale.

Monitum. By AGATHON. Eighth edition. London: Burns & Co.

Theory and Practice. By AGATHON. Tenth edition. London: Burns & Co.

THESE two tiny works are put together with a great deal of force and vigour; and have strong claim on the attention of Protestants. In the former, the author pursues the excellent course of stating at the outset the data which he assumes: these are all the doctrines held in common by Catholics and by Trinitarian Protestants. He is occupied throughout the tract in maintaining that, granting these data, Catholicism must be true: for no religion, he argues, can be from God, which does not claim exclusiveness and infallibility; and this no Protestant sect ventures to do. We fully agree with the author that it is impossible to exaggerate the conclusiveness, in their own sphere, of those historical and external arguments which establish the truth of Catholicism; among which a prominent place should be given to that on which he lays stress. But it seems to us that he has exaggerated the

sufficiency of external and historical proof. Very many Protestants, *e. g.*, consider the Catholic religion idolatrous ; and confessedly no amount of external argument would justify a man in accepting an idolatrous creed. It is surely, therefore, an essential (and not a superfluous) labour of Catholic controversialists, to show that the Catholic creed is not contradictory to natural religion.

The second tract treats the obligation incumbent on Protestants, of studying Catholic works, and of judging for themselves on the question at issue. Nor can any argument be more irrefragable than this, or more urgently needed, as addressed to that large number of Protestants, who profess to form their creed by inquiry and examination, and yet shamelessly neglect all study, or at least all careful study, of Catholic controversial treatises. Yet we think that in this tract, as in the former, the author is somewhat too sweeping. The case is surely by no means unfrequent of a conscientious and pious man, educated in Protestantism, who is plunged in the duties of active life, and has neither leisure nor indeed capacity for religious controversy. We would suggest to our author whether the wisest course of such a Protestant would not be—to act faithfully, in the strength of prayer to God, on those truths which he has already learned ; to supplicate diligently for further light ; and, in one word, to lay his controversial stress (if we may so express ourselves) on his cultivation of the interior life. We are disposed to think that many such men have, through such means, been drawn by God's grace to the full Truth ; and that many more have achieved salvation, through Divine faith in those true doctrines which they have learned, though they have died in (invincible) ignorance of Catholicism. The question is one of great practical importance, and deserves a much longer consideration than we can here give it.

Revue des Questions Historiques. Paris : Palmé. 1866.

WE have received the first two *livraisons* of this *Revue*. Its sphere of labour is to be historic revision, in the interest chiefly of the Church and of France. "We engage," says M. de Beaucourt, for himself and his coadjutors, "in the study of questions of history, without passion, without prejudice, with the sole wish to find out the truth and speak it." Of the several interesting historical controversies treated in the numbers before us we have only time at present to allude to one. The alleged fall of Pope Liberius is often both a stumbling-block to the well-disposed and a weapon in the hands of the enemy. It is quite time that a question which really presents such abundant materials for its solution should be solved once for all, and satisfactorily. M. Edouard Dumont, in an elaborate essay on "Saint Liberius, son Exil, sa prétendue Faiblesse, et sa Triomphe," has endeavoured to perform this task.

Liberius was chosen Pope (352) on the death of Julius, who had consolidated the work of the great Nicene Council by the justification of S. Athanasius and by the Council of Serdica. His successor had no sooner seated himself in S. Peter's chair than a violent effort was made by the

Arians, backed by the power of the Emperor Constans, to force him to condemn S. Athanasius. Liberius saw through their artifices, and resisted. Constans, freed from his troubles with Magnentius, lent all his power to Ursacius and Valens; at Arles (353) and at Milan (355), Councils were held, which were turned into the merest nullities by the brutal tyranny of the court party. Liberius protested against both, and was in consequence carried off from Rome by an imperial emissary, and brought before the emperor at Milan. It must be observed that, up to this point, the demand of the Arians was, that Liberius should condemn Athanasius. This is evident both from the letters of the Pontiff and from the account of the interview with the emperor given by Theodoret. At Milan the Pope was still firm, and would make no compromise. He was thereupon sent into exile, and spent from eighteen months to two years at Bercea, in Thrace. This brings us to 357. Now, at the end of this year, it is certain that Liberius re-entered Rome in the midst of the greatest demonstrations of joy on the part of the Roman people. What induced Constans to allow him to return? One party maintains that it was because Liberius had yielded to the heretics; the other, that Constans had yielded to the loudly-expressed remonstrances of the Romans. According to the former, Liberius, wearied out with a year and a half of his Thracian Siberia, gave notice that he was ready to condemn Athanasius, was brought to Sirmium (further to the north-west, in Pannonia), and there subscribed a certain Sirmian formula.

Now, six years back (in 351), there had been a Council at Sirmium, in which at least two formulas came into existence. The first was a profession of faith directed against the heretic Photinus, and had nothing to do with the differences between the Catholics and the Arians. The second was an afterthought on the part of some of the heterodox bishops who remained at Sirmium after the conclusion of the Council, and who seized the opportunity to draw up an Arian profession of faith, with the intention, which they partly carried out, of passing it off as *the* formula of the Sirmian Council. This was in 351. The question then is, What Sirmian formula did Liberius subscribe? The first, says Baronius, and therefore he did no harm. The second, answer Blondel and the most violent of the Protestants. A third, reply others, as Valesius and Pagi, who try to make out a sort of *via media*. But where does the third Sirmian formula come from? The third formula purports to have been a profession of faith and condemnation of Athanasius forwarded by Liberius from Sirmium, in answer to a deputation from a certain synod of Ancyra, held in 358, which had condemned Photinus. Unfortunately for the third formula, Liberius had returned to Rome at least six months before the synod of Ancyra met. The question, therefore, lies between the first and the second. If Liberius signed any Sirmian formula, it must have been in 357, six years after the Council of Sirmium; for there is no proof that there was anything in the shape of a Council at Sirmium in 357. And the first thing to notice is, that the Sirmian formulas, which seem to have been entirely forgotten during the six years, are revived again for the purpose of obtaining the signature of Liberius. But, again, What are the authorities for the fact of Liberius having subscribed at all? The only positive proof that is given is what is called the "sixth fragment"

of S. Hilary, which is now recognized to be entirely worthless, for the reason, among others, that it introduces, as signing the same formulary, some bishops who were far away from Sirmium at the time, and one or two who were no longer alive. The fact is that no one in 357 troubled himself about any Sirmian formula; the great object of the heterodox party was to make Liberius condemn S. Athanasius.

The next question, therefore, is, Did he condemn him? And here we seem to have the express testimony of S. Athanasius himself, of S. Jerome, and of S. Hilary, that Liberius fell in some way or other; and what is more, three letters from Liberius himself, announcing to different bishops that he had condemned Athanasius. But, first, the passages in S. Athanasius have evidently been interpolated; secondly, S. Hilary means almost exactly the reverse of what is usually attributed to his words; thirdly, S. Jerome's words are not S. Jerome's at all, but those of the *Chronicle* of S. Jerome, which every one knows has been touched up by a much later hand. Then the three letters are proved, from internal criticism, to be a forgery of a later age. Finally, the complete silence of nearly every interested party concerning the pretended fall and retraction is a most weighty proof against their ever having taken place. Rufinus, who lived at the time, says he did not know whether Liberius had acquiesced in the emperor's will or not (evidently implying that he had never tried to find out). The Greek and Latin Fathers who opposed Arianism in the fourth and fifth centuries say nothing about it. The most audacious persecutors of the Pope never mention it, not even at Rimini, which was the very time when they could not have omitted to appeal to it. And the Pope himself, in letters written after his return to Rome, never breathes a syllable that can be construed to imply an apology for such a grave fall, and this in documents where such apology would have been almost an act of necessity had he really fallen.

Such is an outline of M. Dumont's arguments. They are interesting and well put. He does not conceal the fact that they are chiefly a reproduction of the essay of Father Stilling, written a century ago, in the sixth October volume of the Bollandists. We think that the most difficult piece of positive evidence to get over are the letters of Liberius himself, and to do this requires rather more space than M. Dumont has devoted to them. As to the negative arguments against the fact of the fall, he leaves little to be desired. Meanwhile, it is surely the extreme of puerile absurdity for any one to speak as if the fall of Pope Liberius were an historical certainty!

Clément d'Alexandrie. Par M. l'Abbé Freppel. Paris :
Ambroise Bray. 1865.

THE Abbé Freppel has now given to the world a series of works on the early Fathers of the Church. They come before us in the shape of Lectures, and appear to be published in the same form as they were delivered in the author's course of Sacred Eloquence at the Sorbonne. The volumes already published are the following :—

- Les Pères Apostoliques et leur Epoque.* 1 vol.
Les Apologistes Chrétiens au 11^e Siècle. 1^{re} Série. *S. Justin.* 1 vol.
Les Apologistes Chrétiens au 11^e Siècle. *Tatian, Hermias, Athenagoras,*
Théophile d'Antioche, Méliton de Sardis, &c. 1 vol.
Saint Irénée et l'Eloquence Chrétien dans la Gaule. 1 vol.
Tertullien. 2 vols.
Saint Cyprien et l'Eglise d'Afrique au 11^e Siècle. 1 vol.

And, finally, the volume named above.

In accordance with the main object for which they were delivered, these Lectures deal chiefly with the literary aspect of the Fathers of whom they treat. The result is that they are one of the most charming introductions to Patrology that the general reader or the young student can desire. Their charm (we use the word advisedly) lies in the broad sweep of the author's eloquence, and the felicity of choice and accuracy of penetration, with which he carries the attention of hearer and reader through the much neglected tomes that he undertakes to interpret. He is enabled to waive difficult controversies, and merely to hint at knotty points of criticism; though it must be added that he makes not a few contributions, in the best spirit, to both polemics and criticism. But his task is positive, not negative. It is to set before a sympathetic audience such a picture of the great minds of the early Church as his conscience tells him is true and his powers enable him to draw. He who would do this must join unwearied industry to a bright imagination. He must study and dissect original texts, and be ready to illustrate them from a wide range of reading. He must steep himself in old controversies, and work his mind into the postures and habits of the past, and, again, he must be skilled to make the monumental past touch the shifting present, and leave its impress there. He must be too fair and conscientious to mislead the young or the credulous merely for the sake of effect; and yet he must be so vivid and picturesque as to seize the attention of a distracted generation, and teach it a lesson while he tells it a story.

S. Clement of Alexandria is the first of the writers of the Church, who, in the East, made the attempt to establish and work out a substantive system of Christian philosophy, such as might compete with the boasted philosophies of Greece.* In the almost contemporaneous writings of S. Irenæus we do indeed find fragments of scientific speculation, and he, as well as the Alexandrian doctor, claims the true Gnostic as nothing but the true Christian. But S. Irenæus distrusts philosophy, warns it completely off the domain of Faith, and only allows it to speculate on the reasons of the great facts that Faith teaches, without daring to extend or explain the substance of dogma itself. But S. Irenæus had not to deal with Alexandrians, and he did not live near the university of the Ptolemies. S. Clement found it necessary to be more cordial in his dealings with *γνώσις*, and it was a necessity that did no violence apparently to his own sympathies. He tells the philosophers that there is no knowledge worth the having unless it be grounded on Faith; but that, with and by Faith, the Christian could rise to a *γνώσις* compared with which theirs

* *Alzog*, Grundriss der Patrologie, p. 120.

was but a shadow.* Pagan philosophy was doubtless real and good in its sphere ; but it was meant as a preparation for the Revelation of Jesus Christ ; balk it of this its legitimate term, and it dies, withers, and becomes a nuisance. But let it receive the Faith, and then there are, practically, no bounds to its progress. It may not, indeed, add to or alter the Faith received from the Apostles, but its sphere is to confirm and develop it, to set forth its various relations with man and things, and to formalize and systematize it. Over and beyond this, the Word Himself becomes the teacher of the believer, and leads him to heights and depths far out of the reach of earthly philosophy.

To most readers of Clement of Alexandria the most attractive side of his mind is his devotion to the Logos, the Uncreated Word of God. This devotion, so marked, so personal, and so fervent, in Clement and Origen, and in Origen's scholars, as S. Gregory Thaumaturgus, almost amounts to a proof that personal devotion to Jesus Christ had developed in those early ages, at least at Alexandria, to a greater extent than is commonly allowed. It seems to have been an inheritance in the Alexandrine Church. Doubtless the Logos doctrine of Philo did much, by force of contrast, towards defining it ; for nothing is more instructive than to trace out the difference between the Logos of Philo and that of S. John and the Christian teachers of Alexandria ; the former an impersonal archetype of the material world ; the latter the Creator of all things, the source of intellectual and moral light to every rational being, and the personal object of the prayer and worship of the Christian. In Clement the Logos is the *Pædagogus*, or instructor of humanity ; since His coming on the earth it is useless to seek the solution of the great questions of the soul in any other school but his. It was through His light and help that Greece speculated, that Plato saw and taught whatever truth and goodness he did see and teach ; but now that He has come Himself, all other systems and attempts are, at the very least, out of date. He has come to teach every man, not merely philosophers and educated people. And He begins His work by a process which no heathen philosopher ever dreamt of attempting, namely, the moral regeneration of the world. He heals it first, then teaches it. Having healed it, He illuminates it with His divine light, reigning in a special way in the intellect of every baptized Christian ; He models it after His own blessed life ; He guides it through the darkness of nature and the wanderings of error by the light of His precepts and the strength of His might ; He warns, threatens, reproves, accuses, rewards, encourages, consoles, acts everywhere and in all things as the lover of men (*φιλάνθρωπος*). We are the children of the Father, the "nurslings" of the Word. He would have us return to the simplicity of infancy, to the guileless, trusting love of little children, as a preparation for what He will do for us. Listening to Him, and conforming our life to His, the Christian's life is ever fresh, fair, and young ; it is with us the perpetual spring of childhood, for the truth that is in us and the effects of the truth never grow old. This striking way of impressing upon his hearers the great fact of the Revelation of Jesus Christ and the great gift of Faith is peculiarly adapted to the circumstances in which Clement taught. Philo-

* Οὐτε ἡ γνῶσις ἀνευ πίστεως, οὐτ' ἡ πίστις ἀνευ γνῶσεως. Strom. v. l. See Freppel, "Clément d'Alex.," p. 356.

sophers speculated about the source of knowledge, about truth, about regeneration, about the Logos. These speculations the Alexandrian doctor puts at rest by his exposition of the mystery of redemption and of grace. But the glowing, picturesque, and emotional language in which he does this is an especial characteristic of his school. Such a method of treatment has doubtless a superficial appearance of tending to false mysticism. It seems to make too much of interior lights and to leave a man too completely to what may just as well be pernicious dreams as heaven-born truth. But S. Clement is most emphatic, on the other hand, in maintaining an external authority, that is to say, the Church. What he says about the Church is not the least interesting of the testimonies for which we are indebted to him; the reader may consult with advantage the Abbé Freppel on this subject (pp. 195 and 341).

A history of the works of Clement of Alexandria raises many interesting subjects, in addition to those we have briefly mentioned. How far, for instance, were the Greek philosophers acquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures? What is the reason of the peculiar force with which he insists on self-denial in his instructions to converts? Was the fragment on the "Salvation of the Rich" a true homily, or pair of homilies? And this leads to an inquiry as to the rise of Christian preaching, a subject which our author treats in some degree here, though we suspect he will have to return to it at greater length when he comes to the Homilies of Origen. Then the hymns which are attributed to Clement suggest an episode on the early poetry of the Church. The relations of Faith and Science to each other occupy three whole lectures—not at all too many for the singular interest of such a question at the present moment. Then Clement's dealings with the holy Scriptures, his system of interpretation, his allegorical bent, his tendency to the mystic and the symbolical, are with difficulty confined within the bounds of one discourse. The concluding lecture is a special explanation of his mystical theories, which the Abbé Freppel does not altogether approve, but which he defends with great ease from the absurd charge of Pantheism.

M. Freppel is not one of those who are blind to the defects of their hero. He finds fault with S. Clement on more than one point. He blames him, for instance (p. 112), for his undue admiration of Plato, and shows that, through an excessive desire to find Plato in accordance with the Gospel, he discovers in Plato what no one would have been more astonished to hear of than Plato himself. He denies that it is possible to find in Plato either the Trinity, the dogma of creation *ex nihilo*, beatitude, immortality, or any leading doctrine of Christianity, clearly inculcated, or at least unmixed with gross errors. He is doubtless quite right here. At the same time, it seems certain that Clement would have admitted as much. In the 6th chapter of the "Exhortation to the Greeks," where Clement introduces Plato as a witness of the truth of One God, the Maker of all things, a doctrine which Plato undoubtedly taught in some shape, even here he says at the outset, "I do not altogether refuse to admit Plato"* (as an assistant in my search), a formula which indicates that

* Οὐ γὰρ παντάσῃν ἀπεγνώκαμέν γε, εἰ βούλει τὸν Πλάτωνα.—Cohort. ad Græcos, c. 6.

he is going to praise Plato as far as Plato goes, but by no means to assert that he goes all the way ; which he actually does in the sequel. But M. Freppel may be easily excused for speaking rather strongly of Plato's shortcomings in comparison with revealed truth. The Naturalism and Rationalism of the present day, in the midst of which the lecturer frequently shows his consciousness of living, render it most important that a young auditory should not go away with incorrect notions about the necessity of Revelation and Grace ; and therefore the dozen pages which are consecrated to Plato's deficiencies are not the most worthless in the book. There is little doubt that Clement would have subscribed them "with both hands," had he lectured at the Sorbonne in 1865, instead of in the Alexandrian Didaskalia in or about 200. Naturalism was not very significant in those days, among a people that looked for the supernatural in the very beasts and creeping things, and among philosophers who handled even the figures of arithmetic and geometry as if they expected them to prophesy. If Clement was tender to Plato, it was no doubt partly because he liked his lofty thoughts and his grand manner, just as S. Thomas, for different reasons, liked Aristotle ; but it was also because he wished to strengthen and comfort the earnest minds of his day by showing them that Christianity was not a revolution in what natural reason taught to be true and good, but an enhancement, an elevation, a real and marvellous progress.

Any reader who wishes for a clear and large idea of Clement of Alexandria, of his style, his worth, and his epoch, will thank us for recommending to him the Abbé Freppel. The author's own style is not the least pleasing attribute of his books. It is copious and flowing, perhaps with a tendency to diffuseness, as is to be expected in a work that is half declamatory, but it is full of nerve and vigour, and never tedious, even when most luxuriant. An extract or two, which we venture to translate, will give a better idea of his language and manner than any description. He concludes the eighth Lecture with an "appreciation" of Clement's style :—

"Clement of Alexandria possessed in a rare degree two faculties not generally found together, but which, when united, can do marvellous things,—the spirit of the philosopher and the inspiration of the poet. Hence the winning attractiveness that he imparts to Christian morality and metaphysics. Dogma, precepts, institutions, come out under the touch of his pen in the brightest and the boldest relief. He appropriates every colour in nature, he applies every fact of history, to give life and interest to his teaching. Like Tertullian, he has created a language of his own, out of sacred Scripture, Pagan mysteries, Greek philosophy, and Greek poetry ; a daring and picturesque language that never shrinks at a metaphor, but which for that very reason has not always the precision of a scholastic ; a defect, however, well made up for by higher qualities. I said that the thinker and the poet meet in his rare nature ; add to these the mystic, gracefully and skilfully handling the secrets of piety. Gentlemen, when lofty intellect, deep sentiment, and rich imagination are joined in fruitful unity, they stamp upon the mind's work an impress of originality that extorts admiration ; and one of the noblest pleasures of the heart is to converse with men to whom God has given endowments such as these" (pp. 205-6).

In Lecture XVI. he speaks of the mutual relations of Science and Theology. He notices the three great epochs at which the sciences and the arts

have been most remarkably grouped around Theology, glorifying her and receiving strength and inspiration for themselves ; first, the period that commenced with the Alexandrian school, and culminated in S. Augustine ; secondly, the middle age, the age of the great Universities, and of the *Summa* ; and thirdly, the great French period of the seventeenth century. He concludes the lecture as follows :—

“It must be owned that at present there are symptoms of division, of a tendency to wrench asunder that which ought to be united. In geology, in astronomy, in chemistry, hasty conclusions are made, and theories put forth that are hostile to revelation. Gentlemen, this is only for a time. Here, if anywhere, we may be sure that the future will correspond to the past. The facts of geology, of ethnography, of physiology, will in time be studied with greater care, and appreciated with less prejudice ; and, becoming thus better known, will come, as of old, to lean themselves on the truths of Faith ; and the triumph of Theology will be all the more splendid. The synthesis of the sciences will be made anew, and on a broader base than ever before ; the very men who are doing their best to hinder it, will hasten it by their labours and their discoveries. For man is powerless to undo the plan of God ; and the plan of God is, the union of intelligences in faith, and the union of hearts in charity” (p. 409).

We hope to be able to return to the Abbé Freppel, and to consider in future numbers some of his other publications.

Spinoza et le Naturalisme Contemporain. Par NOURRISSON. Paris :
Didier, 1866.

IT is not a little difficult to understand the reasons of the reputation of Benedict Spinoza. A Jew, Portuguese by descent, though Dutch by birth, he was whilst yet living anathematized by the Synagogue and distrusted by Catholic and Protestant. After his death (1677), and the posthumous publication of the *Ethica*, a literary war began, and was carried on with the literary animosity of the period for upwards of a hundred years. Lessing, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel acknowledged him, more or less explicitly, as their master, and perhaps it is to his adoption by such a school of thinkers as that represented by the three last-named, that is chiefly owing both the fame and the infamy with which his name is associated in the present generation. By Catholics, at least, he is regarded as the founder of modern Pantheism, and no amount of explanation can get rid of his denial of the personality of God, and his assertion of unity of substance in the universe. We often hear it said that his writings are most dangerous and seductive. If it be meant that the spirit which dictated them, that is, the insane wish to confound God with Nature, is very common and contagious, more especially in intellectual minds destitute of the true Faith, this is undoubtedly quite true ; but as far as Spinoza himself has embodied this tendency, it is not easy to see what there is in his attempts at proof, or in his style, to seduce or captivate his readers. The great axiom or principle on which he founds his whole system is a transparent sophism that has been exposed by all sorts of writers,

from Bayle to Michelet and Father Schrader. "Per substantiam intelligo id quod est in se et per se concipitur;" and he argues that since there can be only One Being which exists by Itself, and is conceived by Itself, therefore there is but one substance, and whatever is is God. The answer is that Substance is that which is, and is conceived, by itself, in the sense that it does not require any subject in which to inhere, as an attribute or accident does; not in the sense that it has no cause or source of being distinct from itself and continuously preserving it in being; which latter is the sense to which Spinoza chooses to restrict it. This leading fallacy or assumption has not even the poor satisfaction of being the legitimate father of the other fallacies that succeed each other in his quasi-mathematical pages. It is only by several independent and gratuitous assumptions that he succeeds in demolishing the notions of Freedom, of the Last End, of the difference between Good and Evil, of Reward and Punishment, and of the Immortality of the Soul. So that the mere "concatenation," as he calls it, of his scientific method, would hardly entangle the simplest of logical amateurs. As for the dangers of his style, we may accept the testimony of Voltaire (quoted by M. Nourrisson, p. 257, *note*), "You are very confused, Benedict Spinoza, but are you as dangerous as people say? I maintain you are not, and my reason is, that you are confused and that you write in very bad Latin, and that there are not ten persons in Europe who read you through, though you are translated into French."

The uneasy feeling which has ever prompted sinning human nature to attempt to extinguish, by some sort of satisfactory reasoning, the awful truth that it is responsible, expresses itself in our days in the shape of Naturalism and Rationalism. Spinoza said there was nothing but God, and Nature was God, and man a mode of Nature. The German idealistic school said that God and Nature and Self were one and the same thing—that is, thought. Responsibility was destroyed in both systems. But Naturalism does not pretend to deny the separate existence of God and Nature; it contents itself with denying all connection between them. An original creation it may, speculatively, allow; but after that, Nature is complete and self-sufficient; all its laws and promptings are good in themselves; to obey its laws is true morality, and to carry out its promptings is real beatitude. Sin is, to thwart Nature; responsibility is the certainty that Nature will take its own revenge, and that revenge is, punishment. As to what will happen after death, all is haze and mere conjecture.

Our author says (p. 245) that original Spinozism differs from traditional Spinozism; that Spinoza taught *acosmism*, or, in other words, denied Nature as distinct from God, whilst those who quote him teach Naturalism. But perhaps it would be more correct to say that no one now either quotes Spinoza or studies him. He is talked about, certainly, but it is because his name has been received at secondhand from the German idealists (see p. 262), and because he has the reputation of being an honest free-thinker, who does not hesitate to repudiate *religionism*. As such, he is a patron saint, perhaps the founder, of the order of Free-thinkers, even though his method has been superseded and his results considerably modified. If people read him, they would find him but a barren piece of rock; but seen as he is through a transcendental fog, he generally enjoys the reputation of a very Carmel of

beauty and fertility ; only his beauty lies chiefly in his situation, and his fertility is due to the labours of his successors.

M. Nourrisson, in a neat *brochure* of over 300 pages, which has been crowned by the French Academy, has given us a short sketch of the life and doctrines of Spinoza, with some hints towards their refutation, and an account of that naturalism which constitutes their present importance. The style is lively, the treatment interesting, and the learning, of a particular kind, abundant. M. Nourrisson seems to have read nearly every thing that has been written about his theme, even down to the most obscure of the innumerable Dutch Latin squibs and pamphlets in which Spinoza has been extravagantly abused or as extravagantly defended. But, as we have said, Spinoza, by himself, is simply repulsive, and what was said for or against him before Fichte's time has little philosophical interest. We read of, perhaps, three distinct and specific refutations of him in all the fertile period between 1677 and 1800 ; one of which is by the celebrated Benedictine Dom Lami, and another by a Protestant minister. Billuart in his great theological work, written in the first half of the eighteenth century, disposes of him in three columns of indignant appendix, with a scholastic distinction none the less solid because it has been adopted by Voltaire. In fact, the theologians of the day seem to have looked on Spinoza as a mere reproducer of the heresy of David of Dinant, a thirteenth century heretic who had been refuted by S. Thomas. M. Nourrisson would, therefore, have done better service if he had more thoroughly gone into the circumstances of the singular apotheosis of the philosopher of Amsterdam, which was the work of Germany, and whose effects are felt in our own times. On this subject he is meagre and sketchy, and sometimes fanciful, as for instance in his endeavour to show, with the assistance of De Tocqueville, a connection between Pantheism and Democracy (p. 268). Nevertheless, for what he has given us we may well be thankful.

Erasmii Colloquia Selecta ; arranged for Translation and Retranslation. By EDWARD C. LOWE, D.D., Head Master of S. John's Middle School, Hurstpierpoint. Oxford and London : James Parker and Co. 1866.

THE *Colloquia* of Erasmus were in the hands of studious youth in the lifetime of their author (1465—1536), and contributed to make very many readers, both "*Latiniore*s" and "*meliores*," as he himself tells us. About their capability of forming good Latin scholars there can be no question, but it is more doubtful whether they did their young readers no harm. Erasmus was, perhaps, the greatest scholar of his age, and was, besides, what many great scholars of his age were not, a man of exquisite literary taste and good judgment. But he was an easy sensualist and a latitudinarian, and though he never left the Church, yet, as Blessed Peter Canisius says of him, "he laid the eggs that Luther hatched." Many things that he has written would be nothing short of heretical now, and the freedom with which he attacked what were, or what he considered to be, ecclesiastical

abuses, cannot be excused even by the fact that much that he said was quite true; for, in the first place, his ridicule, as ridicule generally does, makes his reader laugh at the true doctrine as well as the superstitious abuse; and, in the next, it was out of his province, in the merely literary character in which he wrote, to censure the ministers of the Church or the practices of the faithful. Therefore, as Canisius adds, "his writings, with a few exceptions, have been forbidden by the Church, as being noxious rather than profitable to their readers, though their author has not been personally condemned."^{*}

The present selection from the Colloquies is intended, as the compiler says, for boys who have begun the Latin Syntax, and is offered to master and pupil as an attempt to enliven the dreariness of "that period of education during which the boy wades slowly through a course of Delectus or other elementary introduction to the Latin tongue." The peculiarity of the dialogues is that they treat, in most classical, felicitous, and yet simple Latinity, of such practical and every-day matters as the way to address people in various circumstances, friendly chat, master and scholar, school affairs, games, piety, inns, and dinners. Boys (and masters too) who are tired of the exasperating inconsequence of Delectus, and who do not keenly appreciate the elegant common-places of Sallust or even the more satisfactory brevity of Cæsar, could not fail to be caught by the quaint Dutch humour and happy phrases of Erasmus. Indeed, it is just possible that the "school-master" might find some passages a little too "light" for academic propriety. Take, for instance, the following after-dinner chat in the playground:—

Vincentius. Libetne decertare saltu?

Laurentius. Ludus iste non convenit pransis.

Vi. Quam ob rem?

La. Quia ventris saburra gravat corpus.

Vi. Non admodum sane qui pransi sunt in pædagogio.

The Colloquies in the selection, if not the best of their author, are at least some of the most harmless. It is a pity the editor has not omitted that entitled *The Shipwreck*, in which devotion to the Saints is most unfairly ridiculed. If the book be admitted into a Catholic school, this dialogue will have to be cut out and burnt, as we should burn an irreverent print or a scurrilous tract. On the other hand, he deserves commendation for inserting the very favourable specimen of Erasmus, called "*Pietas puerilis*," in which a boy describes to a companion what he does to spend the day piously. He has not even omitted the "sign of the cross," which occurs twice, and it is only to be regretted that either his prudent Protestantism, or, perhaps, the exigencies of his space, have not permitted him to insert the whole of the piece, and to present our generation of schoolboys with the picture of one of their Catholic predecessors hearing Mass and going to Confession and Holy Communion.

* Canisius de Corruptel. Verb. Dei, lib. v. c. 10, quoted in *Jortin's Life of Erasmus*, vol. ii.

Le R. P. H. D. Lacordaire, de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs ; La Vie Intime et Religieuse. Par le R. P. B. CHOCARNE, du même Ordre. Paris : Libraire V. Poussielgue et Fils, Rue Cassette, 27. 1866.

MANY of the readers of M. de Montalembert's most interesting life of P. Lacordaire have felt a longing desire to look further into the depths of the noble and loving heart whose pulsations vibrated through the length and breadth of France, and to know more of the inner life of one who swayed with such a mighty mastery the spirits of his countrymen. That desire has been most fully satisfied in the work before us, which is not, as its author tells us, a complete life of P. Lacordaire, but "a study on the interior of his soul, on what he was as a man and as a priest."

There are two points on which P. Lacordaire has been misunderstood and misrepresented both by those who loved and those who did not love him, by those who sympathize in the political views with which his name has been associated, and those who hold them in abhorrence ; and upon both these points P. Chocarne's book throws a most welcome light ; showing, in the first place, that he was no fanatical republican, as many have considered and still consider him ; and, secondly, by its disclosures of his hidden life of severe self-chastisement and self-humiliation (known only to his brethren and children in religion), justifying the words of his devoted friend, Count de Montalembert, "that he was one of the *holiest* souls of our century ; that he was a passionate lover of the Cross of Jesus Christ ; dreading his own glory almost as much as he dreaded sin, and atoning for it by those marvels of voluntary expiation which we are permitted and commanded to admire even when they are far above the reach of our imitation."

The faith which Henry Lacordaire had received with the waters of baptism from the hands of a confessor of Christ was carefully cherished by his mother (*Chrétienne courageuse*), the townswoman of S. Jane Frances de Chantal *la femme forte*, whom S. Francis of Sales found at Dijon. It was stifled for a while by the unwholesome air of his college life.

"I came from college," he says himself, "at seventeen with my religion destroyed and my morals free from all restraint ; but honest, open, impetuous, sensitive to honest loving literature, and all things great and beautiful, having before me, as the leading star of my life, the human ideal of glory. This result is not difficult to be accounted for. There had been nothing to sustain our faith in an education wherein the Divine word was dimly heard, without connection and without eloquence, while we lived all day long amid the examples and the *chefs d'œuvre* of the heroism of antiquity. The old world, presented to us on its sublime side, had inflamed us with its virtues ; to the new world, the creation of the Gospel, we had remained, as it were, strangers. Its great men, its saints, its civilization, its moral and civil superiority, the progress, in short, of humanity under the banner of the Cross, had totally escaped our notice. The history even of our country, superficially looked at, had failed to touch our hearts, and we were Frenchmen by birth, but not in soul.

It is only fair, however, to add that he proceeds to express dissent from Abbé Gaume's vigorous protest against classical studies.

"I was endowed," he says again, "with an incredulous mind and a religious soul." After a struggle of seven years' duration, by the aid of Divine grace, the religious soul mastered the incredulous mind, and the whole man with his inflexible will and feminine reserve and sensibility, "*strong as adamant, more tender than a mother,*" surrendered at once and for ever to his God. By the agony of that long conflict he learned to compassionate the misery of those who, by the sins of their fathers, had been born blind; and to lead them, step by step, with a patient and loving hand, to the full enjoyment of their lost inheritance of faith.

M. de Montalembert has given a touching picture of the new ordeal to which, as a Catholic and a priest, Lacordaire was exposed by his brief connection with the unhappy Lamennais, and of the exceeding cost of mental suffering at which he broke his bonds and by degrees loosened those of his young and ardent fellow disciple. P. Chocarne tells us how the chains fell off from his soul at the tomb of the Apostles.

"Paris," says he, "is to Rome, in a religious point of view, what a frontier continually harassed by the enemy is to a great capital, which sleeps tranquilly under the shelter of its lofty walls. When our heads are grey, and we look behind us thirty years back in the history of our lives, which of us can help smiling at the reminiscence of the infallible systems of his youth and at the recollection of his simple persuasion that the world was about to transform itself in all docility at the breath of his mouth?"

"A journey from Paris to Rome often produces the same disenchantment. We leave the city where all is youth, eagerness, and ardour, and we enter the city of sages and aged men, the city which nothing astonishes, because she has seen all human greatness pass by, like the waters of the river which bathes the feet of her seven hills, where truth alone remains unmoved, impassable, eternal. The Abbé Lacordaire experienced this salutary disenchantment. He came from Paris in company with a man who had made himself a name as great as Europe. That man had a lofty genius, an eloquent pen, and disciples who looked upon him as the only saviour of the Church in its collision with society. What reception will the Church give him?"

"She scarcely notices him. But he brings a system which contains salvation! A system? The Church has watched them all pass by her feet; and salvation has not come to her from thence. But this man has the secrets of the future, and he comes to tell the Church how she ought to speak to nations and to kings! The Church has received from on high that Spirit who is the Spirit of counsel, no less than of truth. Society lives by her, and she has no need to learn from the lips of any man the lesson of her duty to nations and to kings. This tranquillity of the truth which has faith in itself, this seeming slumber of the Vicar of Christ in his bark in the midst of the tempest—this greatness, in short, of Christian Rome was a revelation to the Abbé Lacordaire. Whilst the pride of the master fettered him in his blindness, the humility of the disciple delivered him from the most terrible of all oppressions, the oppression of the mind. He had struggled with a genius superior to his own, and had been overcome. He found himself now face to face, not with the genius of man but with the wisdom of God, in His visible representative, and he bowed with joy before that sweet and sovereign Majesty. It was not without a struggle, however, nor, as he then said to his friend, without having known 'the torments of conscience in the conflict with genius.' 'It was not I,' he continues, 'who delivered myself. When I came to Rome I

knelt at the tomb of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and I said to God: *O Lord, I begin to feel my weakness; my sight fails me; error and truth seem alike to escape my hold. Have pity on Thy servant, who comes to thee in sincerity of heart; listen to the prayer of the poor.* I know neither the day nor the hour; but I saw what I had not seen before. I came forth from Rome free and victorious. I had learnt by my own experience that the Church is the deliverer of the human mind; and, as from the liberty of the intelligence every other kind of liberty necessarily flows, I saw in their true light the questions which now divide the world."

With the light which had thus risen within his soul he kindled once more in France the torch of S. Dominic, which men had thought to be quenched for ever—that murky flame (as they deemed it) visible only in the gloom of the dark ages, burst forth once more bright and clear in the broad daylight of the nineteenth century. The old vaults of Notre Dame, which fifty years before had witnessed the blasphemous worship of the goddess of reason, enthroned on the Altar of God, "beheld the sons of Voltaire hanging on the lips of a Catholic priest; the descendants of '89, docile disciples in the same temple whence their fathers had driven Jesus Christ; the seekers for a new religion, at the feet of the Teacher who proclaims eternally the same creed."

"Quand nous nous faisons moines, nous autres Français, c'est avec l'intention de l'être jusqu'au cou." Thus wrote P. Lacordaire from the Noviciate of La Quercia, and he made good his words by the fervour and regularity which he introduced into his new foundation, and which in the course of ten years from the date of his own profession, led the Sovereign Pontiff to place P. Jandel, one of his earliest companions, as Vicar-General, at the head of the whole Dominican order, with the intention of communicating the more vigorous life and energy of the young French offshoot to the old tree of S. Dominic. "This is to me," wrote P. Lacordaire to McSwetchine, "the most precious recompense of all my labours."

By far the most interesting and instructive part of P. Chocarne's book is the picture which he traces with a reverent and almost shrinking hand, of P. Lacordaire's religious life. He fears to unveil to careless and criticising eyes the penances which became known to his religious brethren only by the thirst for humiliation which accompanied his love of suffering. Whilst we fully sympathize in this feeling, we rejoice that it has not been suffered to interfere with the true and full delineation of a character which must have otherwise been most imperfectly appreciated. "The secret spring of all his heroism, the key to his whole life, was," says P. Chocarne, "his love for Jesus Christ crucified. He had an exclusive and passionate love of the Cross, which urged him to imitate the pattern set forth on Calvary. All his mysticism resolved itself into this very simple principle—to suffer: to suffer for justice in expiation—to suffer for love as a proof of love. He had not received the gift of silent contemplation at the feet of Jesus, but that of proving his love by generous and heroic deeds."

With this burning love of the Cross was combined in fitting harmony that exactness in little duties, and that severe watchfulness against little faults, which make up the life of the religious, and constitute the training of the Saint. P. Chocarne thus concludes this portion of his work:—"Such was this true religious, such is the light in which we have longed to show him,

for this is the side on which he was great before God, and on which also we believe that he will be great before men. He was endowed doubtless with admirable gifts; but what is the genius of man in the eyes of the Infinite Spirit of God? What is the eloquence of man in the presence of the Word of God? But if genius be but a gift, the love of God is a virtue; when carried to a heroic degree, it produces Saints, the only great men recognized by God. Sanctity consists, in fact, in loving as Jesus Christ loved; the greatest Saints are those who approached nearest to this ideal of the Crucified. They are rare at all times; for this love of God crushes our weakness; it is a love strong as death—a love which is death to self. All have not a heart large enough or a soul strong enough to receive it. P. Lacordaire was of the small number of those for whom (in the language which he himself borrowed from Bossuet) the Cross has no terrors, who account it an honour to bear in their body the sacred stigmata of that love—who live by it and die of it. Yes it was in this aspect that God delighted to behold him, when He received into His bosom this generous champion of His love; and doubtless it is in this light also that his numerous disciples and friends, who have been accustomed to admire the man, will love henceforth to venerate the religious. As to those who have too often met him in the stormy arena of our contemporary conflicts to forget that he was the constant adversary of their opinions, will they not forgive, at the touching sight of this virtue so severe to itself, the sometimes indignant frankness of the lover of his age, to remember only the heroic virtues of the lover of Jesus Christ?"

Three Phases of Christian Love. By LADY HERBERT. Richard Bentley.

LADY HERBERT has made a judicious selection of the three holy lives, whose teachings she has brought to bear upon the evils and miseries of our day. S. Monica's beautiful history is beautifully told in the pages before us, and it is not hard to discover that it is told by a mother.

The memory of the mother of S. Augustine is enshrined in the unequalled eloquence and pathos of his history of the wanderings through which he was followed by her patient love, and has come down to us with a wonderful vividness and freshness through the long centuries which lie between her trials and our own. Yet S. Monica can scarcely be said to be a popular saint. It may be that the time for her more general veneration has come. "It is especially in this nineteenth century," says Lady Herbert, "that the example of S. Monica is needed. Among all sad sights, the saddest is one continually presented to our eyes,—that of young men without faith, without hope, living and dying without a thought of God or of the future; with rare intelligences, great in human sciences, rich and prosperous, according to the world's reckoning, yet utterly foolish and blind, and poor and miserable, if they could see themselves, as one day they will, before the tribunal of the Great Judge; and alongside of these men there are ever mothers, or wives, or sisters, seeing all, feeling all, and breaking their hearts at the sight. On the 1st of May, 1850, a certain number of women, perhaps more tried than the rest, met in the

Church of Notre Dame de Sion, founded by the venerable Père Ratisbonne, and, remembering the words of our Lord, '*Where there are two or three gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them,*' resolved, at the foot of the altar, to recite daily certain prayers for their children, and to meet once a month for the same object. From this humble beginning has sprung a Confraternity, or Association of Christian Mothers, which has spread over the whole of the Catholic world, and received the approval of the Holy Father himself. The Association has spread rapidly, not only in Europe, but in India, Africa, and America; and everywhere the name of S. Monica is in mothers' hearts and on mothers' lips. Yes, past centuries scarcely knew her; their need was not so great: God left her for us. Better days will arise. He, who could not resist the tears of the widow of Nain, will be moved by the sight of thousands of mothers pleading for their children's souls."

The second history is the life of *Victorine de Galard Terraube*, who died at Paris, in the odour of sanctity, just thirty years ago. It also has its special lesson for our days:—

"In this nineteenth century," says Lady Herbert, "when, to be brilliant, to be *fast*, and to be admired, seem to be the main objects of English girls; when the style of conversation among themselves is such as to lower, instead of raising, their whole moral tone; and the indiscriminate reading of doubtful popular novels still further vitiates their natural purity and good taste, it has been thought advisable to give a short English version of the life of a young French lady, lately dead: a girl of high birth and station, leading, outwardly, the common life of other girls in a similar position; hoping that some of our young readers may thereby be induced to follow so bright an example."

A third *Phase of Christian love* is exhibited in the history of the venerable *Mère Dévos*, late Superioress-General of the Sisters of S. Vincent of Paul, a perfect exemplification of that life of simple, unresting self-sacrifice, and interior mortification, which characterizes that wonderful creation of the blessed saint—the Institute of Sisters of Charity. Lady Herbert calls her work by the unpretending names of *translation* and *abridgement*, but she has made it fully her own. We hope that she will continue her labour of love, and from time to time prepare for the use of readers, who might otherwise never read, and, perhaps, never hear of such lives as those which she has now brought before them, fresh illustrations of the manifold *Phases of Christian love*.

Judgment in the Case of Dr. Colenso.

THE immediate and direct effect of this judgment is that the trustees of the Colonial Bishopricks Fund (a large sum collected for the express purpose, and held and administered by the trustees—Mr. Gladstone, Sir John Coleridge, and others—under the order of the English Protestant Bishops) are compelled to set aside a capital sufficient to pay to Bishop Colenso during his life somewhat more than £650, the salary promised when the See of Natal was founded. This seems a fair deduction from the principles laid down by the Master of the Rolls. It is hard

upon those who gave the money, because we can hardly doubt that every farthing of it was given by persons who would much rather have spent it in turning Dr. Colenso out of his diocese, or maintaining a rival Bishop in it. But though a hardship, we do not see that it is an injustice or wrong.

But what is really important is the statement of principles laid down as the grounds of this judgment. The salary was originally stopped because, after Dr. Colenso was "deposed" by Dr. Gray, Protestant Bishop of Capetown, the managers of the fund refused to acknowledge him as any longer Bishop of Natal. After the judgment of the Court of Privy Council, which declared this sentence null and void, Dr. Colenso applied for his salary, with arrears, and was again refused on a new ground. The administrators of the Fund replied that the former judgment declared the letters patent under which he claimed to be Bishop of Natal null and void; and therefore, as they argued, he was not a Colonial Bishop such as was contemplated by the conditions under which the money was given, and to which they were bound to adhere. The question, therefore, which the Master of the Rolls had to decide was whether since the former judgment of the Supreme Court a Bishop nominated by letters patent to a diocese in a colony possessed of a separate legislature is or is not, *bonâ fide*, a Colonial Bishop of the Church of England; and in order to answer this question, he had (1) to define the position of such a Bishop as Dr. Colenso (it being assumed that his deprivation is null and void); and (2) the position of an Anglican Bishop in England; and then (3), by comparing these two together, to determine whether the Colonial Bishop is virtually in the same position in the Colony which the Bishop of London, or Oxford, for instance, occupy here.

He laid down that the difference between the two is that the Bishop of London has a Court, which exercises by law an authority derived from the Queen, and subject to be corrected on appeal to her High Court, the Committee of Privy Council, and, as the consequence of this, that his legal authority extends over all men within the local jurisdiction of his court, whether they are members of the Establishment, Catholics, Dissenters, Jews, or Heathens, inasmuch as any of them is liable to be brought into the Bishop's Court—*e.g.*, for "brawling."

The Bishop of Natal, on the contrary, has no court, and, by consequence, no authority over any person whatever, except he can prove in the civil courts of the colony (subject, as a matter of course, to an appeal) that that person has bound himself to him by some contract. Hence, he has, practically, nothing to do with any one except the clergy of the Establishment; for the laity, in fact, do not incur any legal obligations or bind themselves to anything to which they would not otherwise be bound, by calling themselves lay members of the Church of England. The clergy also may at once equally free themselves from him by saying, "In future I do not belong to the Church of England." But as long as they choose to officiate in Church of England places of worship, so long they are bound by the laws of the Church of England so far as they apply to their case. Thus a clergyman officiating in a Church of England church in Natal is bound not to preach or teach anything contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England. This means, as the Judge explained, anything which the Committee of Council has decided may not be

so taught, and, we need not add, the Committee of Council is bound to carry out in this, as in all other matters, the provisions of every Act of Parliament. If, then, a clergyman in Natal should preach any doctrine which the Court of Privy Council has decided to be contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England, Dr. Colenso could proceed against him for violation of his contract before the civil court of the colony, and if the court decided that he had violated the conditions by which he held his position, he might be removed from it; just as a man who undertook to teach a school expressly endowed to teach Latin and Greek, might be deprived of his office if he could be proved to have resolved to exclude from it all such studies. Just in the same way the minister of a Wesleyan meeting-house could be deprived by the same court if it could be proved that he taught doctrines contrary to those which Wesleyan chapels were founded to teach, and this would be decided by a comparison of his teaching with the "deed of trust" by which the Wesleyan chapels were devoted to that purpose, and by the decrees of the "Conference" to which those deeds give the management of the affair.

In the course of this argument the judge had to decide what is the essence (the "differentia," as logicians say) of the Church of England; and this he decides to be the supreme authority of the Queen in all matters spiritual. He most carefully pointed out that a body which hold all other matters of doctrine and discipline, and which is in full communion with the Church of England, so that all persons who were in communion with one would have the same rights in the other, would still be essentially a different church if the Queen were not its supreme authority in matters spiritual; and of course it follows that a sect which openly denies the divinity of Our Lord, or any other doctrine of Christianity, is not merely on that account, any less a part of the Church of England; but only if, and so far as, by denying such doctrine, it did virtually reject and disobey the spiritual authority of the Queen, who has commanded that doctrine to be taught.

And what makes this more important is, that it was laid down with regard to the Church of England here quite as much as in Natal. A Bishop of the Established Church cannot deny the authority of the law, for it is his direct engagement to enforce the doctrine and discipline "as this Church and realm have received the same;" not only "this Church," be it observed, but this "Church and realm." Now how this Church and realm have received it this judgment tells us. No doctrine or practice is to be enforced or observed in the diocese of London or Oxford because it is true, or because it is held by the Catholic Church, or was held by the primitive Church, or because it is plain in Scripture, or for any other reason except this,—that it is one of those doctrines or practices which the Queen, interpreting and applying Acts of Parliament, has decided is to be taught or practised. It is on this ground, and on this ground only, that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, or the practice of baptizing, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, can be held to be part of the teaching or practice of the Church of England. Well may the *Pall Mall Gazette* sum up this matter by saying, that the Papacy of the Queen is the one fundamental doctrine of the Church of England; that whatever man or sect acknowledges that Papacy does *ipso facto* form part of the Church of England,

and that whatever man or sect denies it is alien to the Church of England. Well also may it add, that the question is, how long a body founded on such a principle can continue to exist when this its fundamental principle is so clearly laid down. Admitting this, it highly approves the judgment, not only because it is good law (which we do not doubt), but because it secures men "from being excommunicated or harassed by such men as Bishop Gray"; in a word, because it overthrows all ecclesiastical government.

What makes this more remarkable is that, beyond a doubt, the Colonial Church has been a favourite with the "Puseyite" party in the Church of England, chiefly as a means of striking in the thin end of the wedge by which an opening was to be effected in the direction of ecclesiastical liberty, which was afterwards to let pass the Established Church at home. And most especially this was felt after the former Colenso judgment; which was received by many High Churchmen with considerable favour, because, however much they disliked Colenso, they liked ecclesiastical liberty far more than many disliked him. The Protestant Bishops of New Zealand, we all know, petitioned for leave to surrender their letters patent, and become a Free Church. Bishop Gray proposed to found a "Church of South Africa," and the Bishop of Oxford and others here evidently thought they had made a great step. In what direction the step had been made is now evident. The existence and disputes of the Colonial Church have made necessary the discussion what is the fundamental essential law, the vital principle, of the Church of England, and it is found to be the Papacy of the Queen.

We have heard it asked how this will affect the position of the High Puseyite or Ritualistic party in the Established Church. For our part, we do not see that it will affect it at all. That party had before been able to maintain its position in the Church of England by saying, that they regarded it as a part of the Catholic Church, and therefore believed that it holds all that the Catholic Church holds, and rejects all that the Catholic Church rejects. Of course this is merely a quibble. For while they say this they are as much compelled as anyone else to submit to the practical decision of the Queen in Council. The Bishop of Oxford dare not reject any person presented to a benefice in his diocese because he denies that Baptism conveys any grace. The position is really that of ancient Pistol, "I eat and eke I swear." But such a relation once established, one does not see why *any* decision of the Anglican courts could affect it. Should the Supreme Ecclesiastical Court decide that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity or the Incarnation may not be held or taught in the Established Church, there is nothing, so far as we can see, to prevent the Bishops and clergy from voting that one more act of "persecution," and then going on keeping the social position and the endowments and lands just as they do now, and, still maintaining that the Established Church is Catholic, holds whatever the Catholic Church holds, and anathematizes whatever the Catholic Church rejects.

Of course a Wesleyan or a Baptist might with still more reason profess to be Catholic in the same way, and might hold the meeting-house and endowments belonging to the Wesleyan body, while all the time he declared that he was not bound by any act of the Wesleyan authorities. As long as he

yielded to them practical obedience, he would, we presume, be unassailable by them in the Civil Courts.

For ourselves we imagine nothing could in practice work better for the spread of Catholic truth in England than such a state of things. For on the one hand, it allows Catholic doctrines to be taught, and Catholic worship to be imitated in the Established Church, and thus removes all that part of the anti-Catholic prejudice which proceeds from the novelty of Catholic teaching and practice; and on the other hand it makes it so evident that these things are not really either authorized, or indeed allowed by the Church of England, as to make it more and more difficult to prevent individuals who have learned to receive them as true and acceptable to God, from submitting to that true Catholic Church to which they evidently belong, and of which they form part.

Impressions of Spain in 1866. By LADY HERBERT. London: Bentley.

THE beautiful illustrations of Lady Herbert's volume are not needed to prove that it is written by a true artist. Descriptions of scenery or works of art, except from hands which can use the pencil as well as the pen, are apt to be unreadable; but Lady Herbert carries us with her as her willing companions, in the stifling and cramping diligences, on the mountain paths and along the terrible roads, from which S. Teresa thanked God for her deliverance, and which seem to have been left unattended since her day. We have, perhaps, to thank these difficulties in the way of modern travellers, for the freshness and simplicity of manners still lingering in this romantic and Catholic land; where the spirit of chivalrous courtesy and intense and fervent faith still characterize the countrymen of Pelayo and the Cid, of S. Ignatius and S. Teresa. Lady Herbert's appreciation of the noble Spanish character appears in the following extract; the only passage which our limits will allow us to select, of a volume containing so much that is worthy of notice in a religious, historical, and artistic point of view:—"Catholicism in Spain is not merely the religion of the people; *it is their life*. It is so mixed up with their common expressions and daily habits that at first there seems to a stranger almost an irreverence in their ways. It is not till you get thoroughly at home, both with them and their language, that you begin to perceive that holy familiarity, if one may so speak, with our Divine Lord and His Mother, which impregnates their lives and colours all their actions. Theirs is a world of traditions, which familiarity from the cradle has turned into faith, and for that faith they are ready to die. Ask a Spanish peasant why she plants rosemary in her garden? She will directly tell you that it was on a rosemary bush that the Blessed Virgin hung our Saviour's clothes out to dry as a baby. Why will a Spaniard never shoot a swallow? Because it was a swallow that tried to pluck the thorns out of the crown of Christ as He hung on the cross. Why does the owl no longer sing? Because he was by when our Saviour expired, and since then his only cry is 'Crux, crux.' Why are dogs so often called Melampo in Spain? Because it was the name of the dog of the

shepherds who worshipped at the manger at Bethlehem. What is the origin of the red rose? A drop of the Saviour's blood fell on the white roses growing at the foot of the Cross; and so on for ever. Call it folly—superstition—what you will. You will never eradicate it from the heart of the people, for it is as their flesh and blood; and their whole habits of thought, manners, and customs run in the same groove. They have, like the Italians, a wonderful talent for improvising both stories and songs, but the same beautiful thread of tender piety runs through the whole." Lady Herbert's notices of her visits to the various convents and charitable institutions are especially interesting. She found the children of S. Vincent doing his work in Spain with their wonted energy and self-devotion; the daughters of S. Teresa faithfully fulfilling the mission of prayer and expiation, for which she set them apart three hundred years ago, in days anxious and troubled as our own.

The Month. December, 1866. London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

WE always look forward with great pleasure to each new number of our contemporary; for we are sure to find most interesting matter in each separate part, and the whole animated by a most Catholic spirit. But the December number seems to us so much above even the ordinary average, as to call for a special notice.

First and foremost comes a most effective paper, under the odd title of "Irish Birds' Nests." We have referred to this article twice in our present number; and the deplorable facts disclosed by it on Protestant proselytism in Ireland, contrast shamefully enough with England's loud proclamation of religious liberty. Catholics make no secret of the Church's doctrine, that wherever Catholic unity happily prevails, the civil power should prevent the introduction of heretical worship; but (as is well known) there is hardly any part of Europe to which this principle can be applied. And we will venture to say that in any country wherein Catholics predominate ever so largely, they would be utterly ashamed to practise such a system of proselytism towards their Protestant fellow-subjects, as that of which Catholics are made the victims in these islands.

Secondly, we have to mention the conclusion of a very interesting series on Lacordaire; which in one respect, however, has a little disappointed us. For we should have been glad to learn more distinctly than these papers have explained, what were those exact tenets which, under the name of "liberalism," that most holy man so ardently embraced. On the singularly impressive picture of his interior life presented by F. Chocarne, we have spoken in a separate notice.

Thirdly, from p. 623 to p. 627, we are presented with an essay written (as we understand the Editor) by F. Newman himself, to be translated into French, and to stand as a note to the French translation of his "Apologia." It treats a matter on which it is extremely difficult to write clearly and intelligibly: viz., the respective tenets of those various parties, which are compre-

hended in the English Establishment. Its completeness and the lucidity of its composition are above all praise. And its study will secure French Catholics against any such misconception of facts, as would be engendered, *e.g.*, by a singular paper on the Ritualists, which appears in the November number of the "Etudes." The "Month" article itself also, introductory to F. Newman's paper, is very forcible, and will serve powerfully for a similar purpose.

Lastly, we would draw attention to the very complete exposure of an absurd but really specious article (specious, we mean, to those ignorant of Catholic doctrine) which appeared in the *Saturday Review*, on the nature and effects of excommunication.

The Spirit of the French Episcopate on the Papal Question. With a Preface by HERBERT VAUGHAN, D.D. London: Burns and Co.

THIS most seasonable publication reaches us as we are on the very eve of going to press. We have only had time to look through the Preface, which is truly effective and (as we may say) *bracing*, and which we cordially recommend to our readers. Let them particularly observe the declaration put forth by the University of Cagliari (p. 6) that the Pope's declaration on his civil sovereignty, accepted as it has been by the Episcopate, is the Church's infallible voice.

We may return to this pamphlet in our next number.

WE are extremely glad to see that Mr. Rhodes intends publishing in a collected shape his letters on the Eirenicon which appeared in the *Weekly Register*. They have been among the most effective criticisms of that work proceeding from Catholic sources.

Correspondence.

To the Editor of the DUBLIN REVIEW.

S. SCHOLASTICA'S, CLAPTON,

All Saints' Day, 1866.

DEAR SIR,

In your notice, in the October number of the DUBLIN REVIEW, of my "Review of the Eirenicon," there occurs one criticism against which I feel bound to protest. Commenting on a passage at page 15 of my review, in which I say that "the Church requires no other terms of communion than those which have been laid down by the Council of Trent," you write that you "are sure I cannot have apprehended the full force of my words," because I have "evidently every intention of being entirely loyal to the Church"; but that "the proposition does surely imply that no doctrines are of faith, which have not been defined by an Œcumenical Council; and, consequently, that the Immaculate Conception is not of faith, nor yet the contradictories of those tenets of Jansenius, which the Pope, with full consent of the Episcopate, condemned as heretical."

The statement on which you thus comment, was grounded on the simple fact, that in the office in the Roman ritual appointed for the reconciliation of converts, no other terms of communion are mentioned than those laid down by the Council of Trent,—in other words, the solemn profession of faith for converts in Pope Pius's creed. He who gives his *bonâ fide* assent to Pope Pius's creed accepts, of course, the authority of the visible Church and its Head, in the sense laid down in previous councils, especially at Florence, and acted on in every age; and the merest tyro in Church history knows that the infallibility of the Church has never been considered to be dependent on general councils. In fact, it never struck me that it was necessary for me to guard, by greater explicitness of statement, against being supposed to deny a first principle of theology.

As a passage expressly to the point occurs in a small work which I published a year or two ago, I may as well transcribe it; especially as I remember having the passage in my mind when I was writing my review. It sets forth explicitly what I have always understood was *binding on all Catholics* as to the teaching authority of the Church. "It is not necessary for the Church to be assembled in general council in order that she may express her sentence. No special promises were made by Christ to general councils as such. His promise was to His Church; whether assembled in council in union with her Head the Supreme Pontiff and successor of S. Peter, or whether, without assembling together, the Bishops of the Church Catholic give sentence

in union with their Head : as in the decree of the Immaculate Conception. Whenever or however the Church or teaching body has uttered her voice, it has been in the fullest confidence that Christ's words could not return unto Him void, but that He was with them in their teaching to whom He had said, 'Go you and teach . . . I am with you all days even to the end of the world.'—(*Reasons for Rationalists*, p. 43. Burns & Lambert.)

In the Appendix to my pamphlet there is a passage from a speech of Dr. Pusey's, which you blame me for inserting, without expressing dissent from some of its statements. As these are so evidently such as no Catholic could hold, I thought at the time that no such protest was called for ; but I now regret that I did not express dissent, as you think it possible that some persons might misunderstand me.

I remain, dear Sir,

Yours sincerely,

W. LOCKHART.

[We have great pleasure in inserting F. Lockhart's letter. In the last clause he frankly confesses himself to have fallen into a certain error of judgment ; and we never thought of bringing against him any more serious accusation on the matter.

The earlier portion of his letter confirms the strong conviction which we had expressed, that he had no intention of really maintaining those propositions, which he would nevertheless (we think) have been *understood* to express, by those who took his words in their more obvious sense. We were not aware of the admirable passage which he has quoted from his "*Reasons for Rationalists* ;" or we should undoubtedly have placed it before our readers' eye.

We now understand him to say, that "whenever or however the Church or teaching body has uttered her voice," that voice is infallible. Her voice is infallible, he implies, whether she teaches by her ordinary magisterium or by express decree ; whether she condemns tenets as *heretical*, or only as *unsound* ; whether she defines the Immaculate Conception, or puts forth a Syllabus of censurable propositions. Nothing can be more satisfactory ; and F. Lockhart will have rendered by his letter an important and permanent public service.

It may seem ungracious to raise a petty cavil. But is it strictly the case that "no special promises were made by Christ to general councils as such" ?]

NOTICE.

We have suspended for this quarter our controversy with Dr. Pusey, to avoid too great sameness of subject in one number. The article on Mr. Ffoulkes (though by a different writer) travels necessarily over ground in many respects similar. In our next number, however, an article will appear replying to Dr. Pusey on "Papal Prerogatives."